

A HISTORY OF
THE CREEDS

REV. C. CALLOW



Class

238 P

C135

Book Cop. 1

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

Beside the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

A HISTORY
OF
The Origin and Development

OF
THE CREEDS

ON THE LIBRARY
NEW YORK

BY
REV. C. ^{Charles} CALLOW

LICENTIATE IN THEOLOGY ; LATE BARRY SCHOLAR, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM
CURATE OF TONG AND TONG STREET, BRADFORD

CHEAP EDITION

LONDON

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1900

11

238P
C135

36641

WARRIOR COT NO
YRABLI
WYBY W3M

4V

\$2.00

Dedicated

TO

ALFRED HALEY, Esq.,

Of Wakefield,

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION

OF MANY AND GREAT KINDNESSES RECEIVED BY

THE AUTHOR.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

IN this age of almost unlimited book-making, whoever sends forth a work on a subject which to many appears to be already over-treated must be prepared to give to the public a satisfactory reason for the appearance of his work. My object has been to provide for the benefit of students in Theology who are preparing to enter the ministry of the Church of England the book of which I in other years felt the need, and to supply for them, and for others who may need or desire it, information in a handy and portable form. The present volume owes its origin to the desire to meet this felt want. It is interesting to a student to know whence this or that comes ; but he cannot always afford to purchase works merely for the sake of verifying a single reference, and no library being within reach, he has to forego the pleasure. The basis of the present volume was an essay which gained the Barry Scholarship when I was at the University.

The work does not lay claim to any originality of matter ; indeed, after all that has been written by so many on the same subject, originality is not to be expected of any, least of all of myself. But the plan of the work is more or less novel ; it avoids the torture and trial of the student's patience by the entire absence of the almost indecipherable footnote and references to the pages of some musty tome in a library quite inaccessible to him. It gives the quotations and their source in the body of the text, and it attempts to help the student to understand some of the primary doctrines of Theology by short dissertations, which are couched mainly in the language of great divines ; and, while keeping each section distinct, it endeavours to make the whole a readable and informing volume. I have added what I hope may

prove a useful Index. The work has been prepared at such intervals as I could obtain in a busy, active life during the past eight years, and in which very little literary work besides this has occupied my attention. I am under very great obligations to my predecessors who have written on this subject, and to whose works frequent references will be found. I deeply regret that Professor Lumby, who had most kindly offered to read the proof-sheets for me, should have been removed by death ere I could complete the task, undertaken at the earnest request of many of my friends, and also of my fellow-students. Professor Lumby gave me the fullest liberty to use anything in his book, only asking me whenever I quoted him to quote him fairly.

To those Librarians and others who have so kindly afforded to me, or to friends on my behalf, opportunities of inspecting and perusing the valuable treasures entrusted to their keeping, I owe a deep debt of gratitude, and in particular I would mention the names of Monsieur De Lisle, Director of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris ; and of Dr. Ceriani, of the Ambrosian Library, Milan ; and also of Dr. Temple, Chancellor and Librarian of York Cathedral.

I now send out to the world the results of my study, and trust that the volume may be of real help to many students.

TONG STREET, BRADFORD.

August, 1899.

LITERATURE OF THE SUBJECT.

ALCUIN : 'De Fide S. Trinitatis.'

ATHANASIUS, ST. : 'Contra Arian. Orat.,' 'Cont. Apollinarium,' 'De Synodis.'

AUGUSTINE, ST. : 'De Trinitate,' 'Sermons,' 'De Fide et Symbolo,' 'Enchiridion.'

AVITUS, BISHOP of VIENNE, died A.D. 523 : 'Opera apud Sirmondus.'

BALUZIUS : Editor of works of Regino, 'Miscellanea.'

BARONIUS, CARDINAL : 'Annales.'

BARRY, BISHOP ALFRED : 'Teacher's Prayer-Book.'

BEDE, VENERABLE : 'Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Gentis Anglorum.'

BINGHAM : 'Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Christian Church.'

BRIGHT, CANON : 'Sermons of St. Leo on the Incarnation.'

BROWNE, BISHOP HAROLD : 'On the XXXIX. Articles.'

BULL, BISHOP : 'Defens. Fidei Nicen.'

CUDWORTH, DR. RALPH : 'Intellectual Systems of the Universe.'

CYPRIAN, ST. : 'Epistles.'

DANIEL, CANON EVAN : 'The Prayer-Book.'

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA : 'Ecclesiastical History.'

FFOULKES, REV. EDMUND : 'The Athanasian Creed.'

GAVANTUS, BARTHOL. : 'Comments on the Rubrics in the Roman Breviary.'

GREGORY NAZIANZEN : 'Orations, specially XXI., 'In laudem Athanasii.'

GWATKIN, REV. PROFESSOR : 'The Arian Controversy.'

HAHN : 'Bibliothek der Symbole.'

HARDUIN : 'Acts of the Councils.'

HARVEY, REV. W. WIGAN : 'The History of the Creeds' (Philosophical side).

HÊFFLE, BISHOP : 'The Councils of the Church.'

HEURTLEY, REV. PROFESSOR : 'Harmonia Symbolica,' 'Pamphlet on Athanasian Creed,' 'History of Western Confessions of Faith.'

HINCMAR, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS : Opera.

HORT, REV. PROFESSOR A. J. : 'Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.'

IRENÆUS, ST. : Opera.

KING, LORD CHANCELLOR : 'Critical History of the Apostles' Creed.'

LAMBECIUS OF VIENNA LIBRARY : 'Commentariorum de Bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensis.'

LIDDON, REV. CANON : Bampton Lectures.

LUMBY, REV. PROFESSOR : 'History of the Creeds.'

MABILLON : 'Disquisitio de Cursu Gallicano.'

MANSI : Collections of Canons, etc.

MARTENE : 'De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus.'

MIGNE : 'Patrologia Latina.'

MILNER, REV. JOSEPH : 'History of the Christian Church.'

MONTFAUCON : 'Diatribæ in Symbolum Quicunque.'

MURATORIUS : 'Anecdota.'

NEALE, REV. DR. : 'Holy Eastern Church.'

NEWMAN, CARDINAL : 'The Arians of the Fourth Century.'

OMMANEY, REV. PREBENDARY : 'Early History of the Athanasian Creed,' 'A Critical Dissertation upon the Athanasian Creed.'

PAGI : 'Critica Historico-Chronologica in Annales Baronii.'

PALÆOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY : Facsimiles of Manuscripts.

PEARSON, BISHOP : 'Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.'

PETAVIUS : 'De Trinitate.'

RADCLIFFE, REV. JOHN : 'The Athanasian Creed compared with the Writings of the Fathers.'

ROBERTSON, REV. J. CRAIGIE : 'History of the Christian Church.'

ROUTH, DR. MARTIN : 'Scriptorum Eccles. Opuscula.'

SCHAFF, PROFESSOR PHILIP : 'History of the Christian Church.'

SHEDD, PROFESSOR W. T. : 'History of Christian Doctrine.'

SILVESTRE, M. J. B. : 'Universal Palæography.'

- SMITH, SIR WILLIAM, and PROFESSOR CHEETHAM : 'Dictionary of Christian Antiquities ;' article, 'Creeds.'
- SOCRATES : 'Ecclesiastical History.'
- SOZOMEN : 'Ecclesiastical History.'
- SUICER : 'Thesaurus.'
- SWAINSON, REV. PROFESSOR : 'The Creeds.'
- TERTULLIAN : Opera.
- TILLEMONT : 'Mémoires.'
- TOLEDO, CANONS OF COUNCIL OF, A.D. 405-638.
- VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS : 'Commonitorium.'
- VOSSIUS, GERRARD : 'Dissertatio de Tribus Symbolis.'
- WATERLAND, REV. DR. : 'Critical History of the Athanasian Creed.'

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
I. ANCIENT TITLES OF THE CREEDS :—EXPLICATION OF ‘SYM- BOLUM’	4
II. THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN CREEDS	12
III. THE SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE CREEDS	15
IV. ON THE USE OF THE CREED IN THE EARLY CHURCH	26
V. EARLIEST CREEDS—SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE	29
VI. RECAPITULATION	41
VII. CONDEMNATION OF ARIANISM	46
VIII. THE HOMOIOUSION	54
IX. Ἐκ τῆς Οὐσίας	63
X. Ὑπόστασις	65
XI. THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY	76
XII. SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE SYMBOL	99
XIII. INTRODUCTION OF THE CREED INTO THE PUBLIC SERVICES OF THE CHURCH	107
XIV. SYMBOLUM APOSTOLORUM	110
XV. THE ‘QUICUNQUE’—WHO WAS ITS AUTHOR?	133
XVI. WHAT THEN IS ITS AGE?	149
XVII. ANCIENT COMMENTS UPON THE ‘QUICUNQUE’	173
XVIII. COUNCILS: CANONS AND ECCLESIASTICAL INJUNCTIONS	185
XIX. WHAT WAS THE ORIGINAL PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE ‘QUICUNQUE’ WAS COMPOSED?	193
XX. IN WHAT LANGUAGE WAS IT COMPOSED, AND IN WHAT COUNTRY DID IT ORIGINATE?	199
XXI. THE RECEPTION OF THE ‘QUICUNQUE’ INTO THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH	202
XXII. SOURCES OF THE ‘QUICUNQUE’	206
XXIII. THE ‘DAMNATORY’ CLAUSES	215
LATIN TEXT OF THE ‘QUICUNQUE’	226
ON THE WORD ‘TRINITY’	229
INDEX	231

ERRATUM.

Page 158, line 6 from bottom, *for* 'Pirininius' *read* 'Pirminius.'

INTRODUCTION.

‘The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.’—*Articles of Religion, Church of England, Article VIII.*

THE Church of England in her Eighth Article, quoted above, gives recognition to three Creeds or Confessions of Faith. In the following pages an attempt will be made to elucidate the histories of these confessions, and to bring together, for the benefit of students preparing for the ministry of the Church of England in particular, the results of research by many scholars into the origin, early use, and subsequent development of the Church’s Creeds. In addition to this, an attempt will be made to aid the student in obtaining correct theological knowledge on a few points, specially those which have been much agitated in the past, and which contributed in no small measure to the concrete and particular wording of the Symbols.

In the great religious upheaval which took place in England and on the Continent of Europe in the sixteenth century, the minds of most men were disturbed and perplexed; and, as out of the chaos and disorder there emerged what seemed to many a new Church, they were constrained to ask, Of what authority is this new power? What has it in common with antiquity? In order to settle the unrest and to satisfy the perplexed minds of thoughtful men, the Church of England issued her Articles of Religion. The publication of these Articles was an authoritative pronouncement that the Church of England had not broken with antiquity, but that, on the other hand, she had distinctly retained her hold of the ancient faith, and amid all the

changes of that changing time remained true to the Faith of the Ages, as enshrined in the Creeds of the Church Ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic. The Articles are not always regarded in this light. For a considerable period they were undoubtedly regarded as tests, and a character was forced upon them foreign to that which they were originally intended to sustain. Dr. Swainson, 'The Athanasian Creed, and its Use in the Church of England,' has said (p. 10): 'It will take time for those who have been brought up under the older system of viewing the Articles as tests, to regard the series in their true light as having been intended to contain a manifesto. They deal with doctrine, not with persons. Dr. Newman's words are still heard, that they were drawn up "with the purpose of including Catholics"; we see now how fundamentally wrong his conception was. They were drawn up to exhibit the faith of the Church of England: they were certainly framed to show that in nothing did the faith of the Church of England differ from the faith of the Church Catholic.' And as evidence of this to all the world, she showed in her Eighth Article unswerving adherence to the ancient formularies of the faith.

These Creeds had been the bulwarks of the Church's faith, against which the storms of heresy had beat in vain; and although in some cases the original deposit had been overlaid with accretions from without, yet the original solid rock remained, and to each succeeding generation bore witness to the Church's unalterable belief in the doctrines enshrined within these formulæ, and primarily in the equal Godhead of the Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

From the day when our Lord sent forth His Apostles to 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,' and the Christian kingdom was founded on the earth, a confession of faith, sometimes of greater, sometimes of less length, has been demanded from every applicant for admission into the Divine society. The Creeds were undoubtedly in their developments intended to be exclusive in their operation, and to effectually bar the door against the entering-in of unworthy or heretical applicants. And, however much some men may rail at the retention of these

ancient formulæ by the Church of this later age, they serve their ancient purposes still. The faith we profess to-day is the faith of saints and martyrs of old time ; the very words in which they confessed their unalterable faith as they triumphantly and fearlessly marched to death, are our priceless heritage and glorious possession ; and they are a guarantee to all of the continuity, the stability, and perpetuity of the Church's doctrine.

‘ Faith of our fathers, holy faith,
We will be true to thee till death.’

CHAPTER I.

ANCIENT TITLES OF THE CREEDS—EXPLICATION OF 'SYMBOLUM.'

IN attempting to trace the history of the Creeds, it has seemed most natural to follow the plan adopted by Lord Chancellor King in his 'Critical History of the Apostles' Creed,' and to begin with the explication of the name. This is historically the wrong method, since Creeds existed in forms of greater or less compass and extent for a considerable period before any specific name was used to designate them. Still, it would perhaps be quite correct to say that, although no specific name was in universal use for a time, yet when speaking or writing of the Confession of Faith which we call the 'Creed,' such a designation was employed as left no doubt in the minds of hearers or readers as to what was intended.

The most ancient Creeds, though alike in substance, differed as well in name as in form, for we find that various titles were used both in East and West before one name came to be universally accepted. A few of the more common names are given below as specimens. The Greek are given first, as being most ancient, the earliest Creeds being in Greek, and Eastern in their origin, which circumstances are accounted for by the fact that Christianity was first promulgated in Greek-speaking countries.

Theodoret, Hist., lib. i., cap. vii., calls it ἡ πίστις. Gregory Nysseni, 'De Virginitate,' cap. xi., tom. iii., has ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις.

Cyrillus Alexander, 'Jesaïæ,' cap. lxvi., dicit:—κατὰ γὰρ τὰς εὐαγγελικὰς παραδόσεις.

So, too, Balsamon, 'Ad Can. VI. Concilii Nicæni,' ii.,

p. 60. Isidorus Pelussiota, Epist. 114, lib. iv., ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας. 'Ep. Conc. Antioch. ap. Euseb.,' lib. vii., cap. xxx., Ἀποστὰς τοῦ κανόνος.

Students who may wish to verify the above can refer to Bingham, 'Eccles. Antiquities,' book x., cap. iii., sec. 3; and also to Suicer, 'Thesaur.,' art. Κανὼν. Reference may also be made to Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 2, note 2. Latin writers have been still more prolific in the invention of names and epithets to describe the epitome of the faith. The word Creed is obviously a corruption of Credo. With this word all Western Creeds begin; but all Eastern Creeds invariably began with Πιστεύομεν. The common appellation of the Creed in Irenæus, Tertullian, Novatian and St. Jerome, where they speak of the deviations of heretics from the common Articles of the Christian faith contained in the Creeds of the Church, is 'Regula Fidei.' As, Irenæus, 'Contra Hæreticos,' lib. i., cap. xix. Tertullian, 'De Præscript adv. Hæret.,' cap. xiii.: 'Regula est autem Fidei, quâ creditur unum omnino Deum esse,' etc.

Tertullian, 'De Veland. Virginibus,' cap. i.: 'Regula autem Fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem.'

Novatian, 'De Trin.,' caps. i. and ix.: 'Regula Veritatis.' Heiron., Ep. 54 ad Marcellam, 'Contra Errores Montani': 'Primum in fidei regulâ discrepamus.' Rufinus, 'Expos. in Symb. Apost.,' sec. 3: 'Normam prædicationis.' Salvian, 'De Gubern. Dei,' lib. vi.: 'Munus salutis.' John Cassian, 'De Incarnat. Domin.,' lib. vi.: 'Catholici Sacramenti Fides.' Ambrose, tom. i., 'De Virgin.,' lib. iii.: 'Nostri Signaculum cordis—Militiæ Sacramentum.' The Latin 'fides' is the Western equivalent of the Eastern ἡ πίστις, and was sometimes applied to the Creed, as its name and title; but, as the cases cited above show, it was more usually coupled with some such word as 'Regula.' The encomiums of the Latin writers are very fulsome, but as they more closely concern the Apostles' Creed, and were made in praise of that composition, they will more naturally find a place in the section devoted to that form.

The Latin 'Regula' is the equivalent of the Greek κανὼν, which was, in the East, a favourite name for the Creed. Bingham, 'Eccles. Antiq.,' book x., cap. iii., sec. 2, gives,

as the reason why the Creed was usually called *κανών* = the rule, that 'it was the known standard or rule of faith, by which orthodoxy and heresy were examined and judged.' The word *κανών* is derived from *κάννα* or *κάννη*, *ης* = a reed or cane. 'The word *κανών* signifies a line or rule—a standard, therefore, by which other things are to be judged of. It is applied to the tongue of a *balance*, or that small part of the scales which by its perpendicular situation determines the even poise or weight, or by its inclination either way the uneven poise of the things that are weighed.' (Cosin and Jones, quoted by Browne, 'On the Thirty-nine Articles,' Art. vi., sec. 2).

Κανών was also used passively for the space measured off the racecourse at Olympia; also, any rod used for measuring, a carpenter's rule. In Homer, *κανόνες* are two rods running across the hollow of the shield, through which the arm was passed to hold it by. It was used also metaphorically like the Latin *norma*, a rule or standard of excellence: so the old Greek authors were called *κανόνες*, rules or models of excellence, *classics*; and the books received by the Church as *the rule of faith* are called the Canonical Scriptures, *cf.* Article vi. But none of the foregoing names were destined to become universal as a name for the Creed. It was about the middle of the third century that the term which was destined to outlive all others was first applied by Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, to the Confession of Faith. That name was in Greek *Σύμβολον*, in Latin *Symbolum*. (It occurs in Cyprian, Epist. 76, 'Ad Magnum.') Many explanations have been offered of this word, and a few of these will be found below. Suicer, in his 'Thesaurus,' art. *Σύμβολον*, says: 'Græcis *σύμβολον* proprie est indicium ac signum: quam significationem etiam affert Clemens Romanus, epistolâ supra laudatâ (Ep. 1). Item Isidorus, de Eccles. Offic., lib. i., cap. xx. Hesychius: *Σύμβολον*, *σημείον*, *Symbolum*, *signum*. Veteres Glossæ: *Σύμβολον*, *Symbolum*, *indicium*.' After referring to suggested explanations by various writers, he proceeds thus: 'Magis ridicule qui glossas scripsit in Decretalem Innocenti de summa Trinitate et Fide, hybridam formans vocem *symbolum* conflatum ait ex *σὺν*, quod interpretatur simul, et *volus*; quia nempe ad *symbolum* Apostolicum, tanquam *Epulum*

spirituale, singuli Apostoli contulerint bolum.' Again, Suicerus is of opinion 'that the Creed was called *Σύμβολον* from the military oath or contract which soldiers made with the Emperor, when they entered into his service: for the Creed is a token of the contract which we make with God at our baptism. In support of this he alleges the testimony of St. Ambrose, who calls the Creed 'the oath or bond of our warfare'; and Petrus Chrysologus, who says, 'An agreement or covenant is called *Symbolum* both in human and Divine contracts.' Suicer, quoted by Bingham, 'Eccles. Antiq.,' book x., cap. iii., sec. 1; *cf.* Ambrose, 'De Veland. Virgin.,' lib. iii. Chrysologus, Homily 62, 'Placitum vel pactum, quod lucri spes venientis continet, vel futuri, *Symbolum* nuncupari, contractu etiam docemur humano,' etc. Against this is the opinion of Baronius and some others, who think that it was called *Σύμβολον* from the military *badge* of the soldier, or, as many old writers suppose, that it was so called because it was a collation or epitome of the Christian doctrine. In the latter case, as Lord Chancellor King has pointed out, the name would have been not 'Symbolum,' but 'Symbola.' Rufinus was the first to offer this explanation of the word, who, after he has related the manner of the framing of the Creed by the Apostles, adds, 'That for many and just causes they would have it to be called a symbol; for a symbol in Greek signifies a collation, that is, that which many bring into one, for so the Apostles in this Creed (the Apostles') did bring into one, or comprehend in one thing what every person thought. And Cassian also, 'De Incarn. Dom.,' lib. v., says that 'the Creed was called a symbol because that whatsoever is in an immense copiousness contained in the body of the Divine volumes is by the Apostles collated or reduced into this brief compendium. *Symbolum* ex collatione nomen accepit, collatio autem ideo, quia in unum ab Apostolis domini, Quicquid per universorum divinorum corpus immensa funditur Copia, totum in Symboli colligitur brevitate.'

The pseudo-Augustine descends to particularizing, and points out which article was contributed by each individual Apostle.

This meaning of *Symbolum* is, of course, quite fanciful, and perfectly groundless and unsatisfactory. Lord Chan-

cellor King insists upon the derivation of this term 'from something which in its own nature is more correspondent and agreeable to the worship and service of God wherein the Creed is used. Wherefore, in my opinion,' he proceeds, 'the signification of the word is more naturally to be fetched from the *Sacra*, or religious services of the heathens (if idolatry, impurity, and inhumanity may be permitted to pass under that name), where those who were initiated in their mysteries and admitted to the knowledge of their peculiar services, which were hidden and concealed from the greatest part of the idolatrous multitude, had certain signs or marks, called *Symbola*, delivered unto them, by which they mutually knew each other, and upon the declaring of them, were without scruple admitted in any temple to the secret worship and rites of that god whose symbols they had received. These symbols were of two sorts, either mute or vocal, and were carefully preserved and kept from all public view by the receivers of them, who, upon the producing of them to the priests of those gods whose signs they were, had free admission to their most hidden and abominable rites' (King, 'Crit. Hist. Apos. Creed,' pp. 11, 12).

The student who wishes to verify these remarks by reference to the original authorities should consult Clemens Alexandr., 'Protreptic,' *ad gentes*, and Apuleius, 'Apologia.'

Another suggested explanation 'of this word "Symbolum" is fetched from military affairs, where it is used to denote those marks, signs, watchwords, and the like whereby the soldiers of an army distinguished and knew each other.' Thus Maximus Taurinensis supposes it to be 'called "the symbol" because it is a *sign* or *mark* by which believers are distinguished from unbelievers and renegadoes.' 'Signaculum symboli inter fideles perfidosque discernit' (Maxim. Taurin., 'Hom. in Symbolo'). 'Symbolum cujus signaculo fideles ab infidelibus secernuntur' (*Idem*). And Rufinus has more largely to the same effect. The Greek word Σύμβολον, he says, may be rendered by the Latin word 'indicium,' which word signifies a sign or a mark of distinction, and was applied to the Creed, because at that time, as is related in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts. xiii. 8 and xix. 13), many of the Jews feigned to be apostles of Christ,

and for the sake of their purse or belly went forth to preach, naming, indeed, the Name of Christ, but not according to the perfect lines of tradition; to remedy which mischief the Apostles appointed this sign or token, by which he might be known who should truly preach Christ according to the Apostolic rules, etc. He goes on to instance the case of a civil war wherein watchwords are employed, so that if one met another of whom he had reason to doubt, by asking him the symbol he might discover whether he was friend or foe (see Rufin., 'Expos. Symboli. Apost. ad calcem Cypriani'; also Bingham, 'Eccles. Antiq.,' book x., sec. 1). To sum up, then: We find that in the earliest age the Confession of Faith, which each applicant for admission into the Christian society was bound to make, was known by several names which were short and expressive. What more natural than for a Greek-speaking Christian to speak of his Confession of Faith as ἡ πίστις, or a Latin as *fides*? Then, as intercourse between East and West became more general, some one universal name for the summary of the doctrines of the faith became an absolute necessity in this religious freemasonry and fraternity. For had not God made of one blood all the nations of the earth? Were not East and West one in Christ Jesus? Was there not henceforth to be one universal brotherhood of believers in Jesus? And the adoption of a universal name for the Creed was rendered still more necessary by the exigencies of the times. Christianity was a *religio illicita* throughout the Roman Empire. Only in secret could they meet for worship; only in secret could they talk with each other of the things which concerned their innermost being. Then, too, the worship which they rendered to God was of a pure kind, and in wonderful contrast to the filthy and obscene services of the heathen; it would be a profanation to let the heathen know the mysteries of the faith. No, none must be admitted to witness the celebration of the divine rites but such as had been instructed in the faith, and had immediately before their admission received the symbol as a password, on the recital of which they could be admitted into the gatherings of Christians wherever found. This was to be most jealously guarded and carefully preserved. On this point Petrus Chrysologus may be cited. In 'Symb. Apost.,' Sermon 59,

he exhorts his hearers to preserve this gift in the most inward recesses of their hearts, not to permit vile paper to depreciate this precious gift, or black ink to darken this mystery of light, lest an unworthy and profane hearer hold the secret of God. And St. Ambrose (tom. iv., 'De Cain et Abel,' lib. i., cap. ix.) exhorts to the utmost vigilance in concealing the Christian mysteries, and, in particular, to be very careful not by incautiousness to reveal the secrets of the Creed or the Lord's Prayer. We may, then, in concluding this chapter, observe, first, that the Creed was by our ancestors very fitly termed a symbol, because it was studiously concealed from the heathen (just as the *Sacra* or *Symbola* of the heathen were from the uninitiated), and not revealed to the catechumens themselves till just before their baptism, when it was delivered to them as that secret note, mark, or token by which the faithful in all parts of the world should interchangeably know and be known. And, secondly, we may observe that Tertullian, in his 'De Præscript. Hæret.,' cap. xxxvi., mentions the agreement existing between the Church of Rome and the Churches of North Africa, and employs a term which gives confirmation to the view advocated here. The word employed is 'contesseratur.' The root of this is 'tessera,' the soldier's password. Bingham regards this as the correct view. Wheatley, Dr. Hey, and some others, including Lord Chancellor King, have considered that the name was borrowed simply from the religious services of the ancient heathens. The student may consult with benefit Browne, 'On the Thirty-nine Articles,' p. 213; Lord Chancellor King, 'On the Creed,' pp. 1-23; Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 2, note 2; Tertullian, 'De Præscript. Hæret.,' cap. xxxvi., 'Cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesseratur.'

Derivation of Σύμβολον.—Σύμβολον, τὸ (συμβάλλω) = a sign or mark to infer a thing by. The plural σύμβολα were, strictly speaking, the two pieces of a coin, etc., which two contracting parties broke between them and preserved, *tallies*. At Athens it signified a ticket, or cheque, to which the Latin word 'tessera' corresponds, which the dicasts had given them on entering the court, and on presenting which they received their fee. Also given on other occasions, as, e.g., to persons who took part in a common meal. The

Latin use of the corresponding term 'tessera' was in several respects similar, and in particular cases identical. Thus, e.g., 'tessera' = a square ticket on which the military watchword was written. 'Tessera hospitalis' = a token of hospitality, being a small die, which friends broke into two parts. (Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, art. Σύμβολον). It seems most probable, then, that the true explanation of the word is that which identifies it with the watchword whereby Christians were known to Christians as distinguished from the heathen, and also whereby the orthodox detected the heretics.

CHAPTER II.

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN CREEDS.

As it will be necessary for the sake of distinction to employ somewhat frequently the terms 'Eastern' and 'Western' as applied to Creeds, it is proposed to give a short explanatory chapter here, in order that the student may be able from the first to understand the differences between the Creeds of the East and those of the West.

The first difference to be noted is the initial word of the Creed. In the East all Creeds began in the plural—Πιστεύομεν, We believe. Western Creeds, on the contrary, began with the singular—Credo = Πιστεύω, I believe. The Creeds of Tertullian are *exceptions* to this rule, for they have many points in common with Eastern forms, and this is one of the points that, in the only two cases in which he quotes the beginning of the Creed, he commences with the plural, 'We believe' (*cf.* Tertull., 'De Præscript. Hæret.,' cap. xiii., and Tertull., 'Adv. Praxeam,' ii.). The same remarks apply to Irenæus, who was much more Eastern than Western by birth and education, and in modes of thought.

The next point to note is the much greater length of Eastern as compared with Western forms. Orientals have a love of marking emphasis by a redundancy of language. We have an excellent example of the extension of an article in the so-called Nicene Creed. In the Western form—the so-called Apostles' Creed—the article is short: 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.' The Nicene form has, in addition, the word 'one' in the first clause, and another clause—'And of all things visible

and invisible'—is added after 'Maker of heaven and earth.' In the East the habits of thought were of an extremely subtle nature; and in discussing these mysterious questions and endeavouring to account for various things existent in the world, men early fell into gross error respecting the unity of the Godhead and the origin of evil. And this in large measure accounts for the greater length of the Eastern forms of Creeds. Heresies arose in both East and West in very early days, and alike in the earliest Creeds of East and West preserved to us, we have inserted this word 'one' in the first clause—'I believe in one God.' Thus in Irenæus and Origen it is *Ἐνα Θεόν*. In Tertullian it is 'Unum' or 'Unicum Deum.' The object of its insertion was to oppose to the early heresies that arose in the Church the true Christian doctrine. Valentinians, Marcionites, Cerdonites, and Hermogenes, all asserted a dual principle—a good and evil God. Some, not all, of the Marcionites asserted two co-eval and co-existent principles, God and matter. Drosierus, in the 'Dialogues' of Origen, affirmed that matter was co-eternal with God (Origen, Dial. 4). And Hermogenes, who was opposed by Tertullian, asserted that matter was co-eternal with the Lord, that it was neither born nor made, but was without both beginning and end. This, Tertullian asserted, was to make two Gods (Tertull., 'Adv. Hermogenes,' p. 264, ed. Parisiis, 1580).

The reason for this erroneous opinion is not far to seek. A question which was constantly agitating the early Church was *Πόθεν τὸ κακόν*; Whence was evil? Therefore, not willing to make God the author of evil, Hermogenes (and many others with him, doubtless), imagining evil to be a substantial nature, and to have an original cause suitable thereto, that he might throw the source and origin of it upon another, affirmed matter to be a natural evil principle, co-eternal with God, who was contrary thereto, whence all other evil had its rise and spring.

Marcion declared that there were two co-eternal, independent Beings: the one a good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Author of the Gospel, and the fountain, source, and origin of all good; the other an evil God, the Creator of the world, the giver of the Law, and the cause,

root, and author of all evil. But going back to even earlier days than those of Marcion, we learn from Tertullian, '*De Præscript. Hæret.*,' p. 95, edit. Parisiis, 1580, that Cerdon introduced two beginnings, that is, two Gods—a good God and a fierce God, the good one being the Superior God, and the fierce one the Creator of the world. And Theodoret, '*Epit. Hæret. Fabul.*,' in '*Hær. Cerdon.*,' p. 93, Rome, 1547, says that he (Cerdon) maintained that there were two Gods: the one a good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; the other a just God, the Creator of all things. And the same author tells us that both Cerdon and Marcion took their tenets from Simon Magus. And we are positively assured by Epiphanius, '*Adv. Hæres. Manich.*,' p. 267, ed. Basle, 1544, that the Author of two eternal principles—a good one and a bad one—went to Jerusalem about the days of the Apostles, and there disputed with the elders concerning the Unity of the Godhead and the Creation of the world. So that it has been necessary even from Apostolic days to maintain as a primary article of the Christian Creed this belief in the Unity of God. In the West, philosophic speculation had but little attraction for those who spoke the Latin tongue, and consequently there were fewer errors in the Western Church respecting this first article of every Theistic Creed. It was not until a comparatively late date that the words 'Maker of heaven and earth' were inserted in any Western Creeds ('*Sacramentarium Gallicanum.*,' A.D. 650).

Then, too, the clauses in Eastern Creeds which treat of the Incarnation and suffering of our Lord have more of detail, and are more precise than those of the corresponding Western forms. Two articles in the Western Creed never found a place in Eastern forms—viz., 'He descended into hell,' and 'The Communion of Saints.' On the other hand, the Occidentals never admitted the words 'Whose kingdom shall have no end,' nor 'One baptism for the remission of sins' (*cf.* Lumby, '*History of the Creeds.*,' p. 15).

CHAPTER III.

THE SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE CREEDS.

IN a preceding chapter we have discussed the various names applied to the Creed by the early Church writers, and endeavoured to trace to its origin, and to deliver a correct explication of, that one name which eventually outdistanced all others as a title for the Confession of Faith. Our next duty lies with the Creed itself. We shall endeavour to carry back as far as possible towards its source and origin the history of the Symbolum, and to trace, as far as the scanty light and literature of the first centuries will allow, the various developments that took place in the formal expressions of the Church's belief. The question which naturally first arises is, Is it possible to carry back this history to Apostolic days? and secondly, Was there in Apostolic days a concrete epitome of the doctrines of Christianity? and a third question is, Which is the earliest Church writer, after the Apostolic age, in whose works we can trace the Creeds?

With reference to the first question, Mr. Wigan Harvey, in his 'History of the Creeds,' pp. 18, 19, endeavoured to carry back 'the first elementary origin of the Christian Creeds to the instruction vouchsafed by our Lord to the Eleven in the interval that elapsed between His resurrection and ascension.'

One of the best specimens of the Creed of the Church of Apostolic days is to be found in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. The formula in use on the admission of new members to the society was doubtless that given by our Lord to His Apostles when He sent them forth to make disciples of all nations, and to baptize them into the name of the Father,

Son, and Holy Ghost. St. Paul, indeed, refers to 'the deposit' and 'the faithful word,' and urges his 'true child in faith' to guard most carefully that which has been committed to his trust, and 'to hold the pattern of sound words' which he has received from the Apostle himself. This all points to a common agreement of teaching and doctrine rather than to a concrete form of words to serve the purposes of a Creed. Bingham, 'Eccles. Antiq.,' book x., cap. iii., sec. 5, remarks: 'It is incredible that a categorical Creed was known to and used by the Apostles, without its having been rehearsed in some of their writings.' The need for this concrete form of words had not, as yet, made itself felt.

As long as the Apostles lived, they were themselves 'witnesses.' The great truths are never apprehended while the great teachers of those truths are living to expound them. The death of a great teacher deepens and disseminates the knowledge of the truth. When a new age shall have succeeded to the Apostolic era, men will endeavour to apprehend those truths put forward by the new exponents of Christianity. Then will arise the need for precise definition, and the Church will be compelled to put into concrete form the doctrines of her belief. And to do this she will have to return to the records of the first age. In these she will find a *θεμέλιον*, a foundation on which such a superstructure can be erected. The framework, so to speak, will be found ready to hand. In Holy Scripture she will find all the doctrines, and the expansion of her expressions of them, and the developments which they will assume to meet the varying needs of varying circumstances will, after all, be 'no more than developments and explanations of the belief in the Three Persons of the Trinity.' So that, although no formal Creed is delivered to us in the writings of the New Testament, yet it is in Holy Scripture itself that we are to look for the *θεμέλιον* of the Creeds. But while the answer to our first two questions must be in the negative, the wondrous unanimity of the Apostolic teaching, it must be admitted, contributed in a most powerful manner to the formation of a concrete form of words; for when we pass from the Apostolic writers to the first and earliest of their successors, in whose works we find a Creed recorded, we

find, as Mr. Harvey remarked ('History of the Creeds,' p. 1), that 'So strong a similarity exists between the symbols of faith of the earlier branches of the Church Catholic that they are very clearly referable to one common origin.'

And Lumby ('History of the Creeds,' p. 4): 'The general agreement in form and contents, so noticeable in the early Creeds which have come down to us, testifies to the probability of some such common form having existed from the earliest times.' The faith itself was possessed in its fulness, and it would be possible to construct practically the whole of the Creed from the writings of St. Paul alone. Let us see how this could be done.

Belief in	Proved by
One God,	1 Cor. viii. 4-6; 1 Thess. i. 9.
the Father,	1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2, ii. 16.
Almighty Creator;	1 Cor. viii. 6; Rom. xi. 36.
one Lord Jesus Christ;	1 Cor. viii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 1.
God's own Son,	1 Tim. iii. 16; Rom. viii. 3, 32.
our Lord;	Rom. vii. 25, xvi. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23, <i>et al.</i>
who was made Man;	1 Tim. iii. 16; Phil. ii. 8; Gal. iv. 4, <i>et al.</i>
crucified,	1 Cor. i. 23, xiii. 4; Gal. iii. 1.
under Pontius Pilate;	1 Tim. vi. 13.
that He died;	Rom. v. 6, 8, vi. 8; Acts xxv. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 3.
that He was buried; de-	1 Cor. xv. 4; Eph. iv. 9.
scended into Hades;	
that He rose again the	1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4,
third day;	vii. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 14.
that He ascended;	Eph. iv. 8, 19; 1 Tim. iii. 16.
that He sitteth at the right	Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1.
hand of God;	
that He shall judge the	2 Tim. iv. 1; Rom. ii. 16;
quick and dead.	Acts xvii. 31.
The Holy Ghost;	1 Cor. ii. 13; Rom. ix. 1;
	Eph. iv. 4.

Belief in	Proved by
the Church ;	Col. i. 18, 24 ; Eph. i. 23 ; v. 27.
the Communion of Saints ;	1 Cor. xii. 27 ; Phil. i. 5, iii. 20.
the forgiveness of sins ;	Eph. i. 7, iv. 32 ; Rom. iv. 7.
the resurrection of the body ;	Rom. vi. 5, viii. 23 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16.
eternal life.	Rom. ii. 7, v. 21, vi. 22, 23 ; Titus i. 2.

The primary article of this, as of all Theistic Creeds, is, it will be seen, the Unity of God. The major portion of the Creed as we now possess it formed part of the regular teaching of St. Paul. The clause on the Unity of God was designed probably to be a twofold guard and protection to the faith. On the one hand there was the polytheism of the Gentile world, and on the other there were the various heresies which sorely troubled the infant Church, and particularly was the doctrine of the Unity of God assailed. Mention has already been made of this matter in the chapter on the difference between Eastern and Western Creeds, and quotations given from Tertullian, Theodoret, and Epiphanius. Irenæus ('Adv. Hæret.,' book i., cap. ii.) says that the Church had received from the Apostles and their disciples BELIEF IN ONE GOD, the Father Almighty, etc. And again, in book v., cap. xvii., he says that the whole Church of God throughout the world 'received ONE and the same God the Father,' and that 'the universal Church received this by tradition from the Apostles, that there was but ONE God, the Maker of heaven and earth' (book ii., cap. ix.). And Tertullian also ('De Præscript. adv. Hæret.') says: 'By the rule of faith we must believe that there is but ONE only God, and that there is no other besides the Creator of the world.' And again, in 'De Virgin. Veland.,' we must believe 'in the ONLY God Almighty, the Framer of the world.' And in the end of the last 'Dialogue' of Origen, where the Articles of the true Christian faith are repeated by Adamantius, he begins it with the belief of ONE and only God, which, as Lord Chancellor King observed,

‘makes it very probable that this clause in the Creed of ONE God was in part designed to contradict the blasphemous and impious conceit of those heretics who introduced more gods than one.’ It was not designed against the Jews, for the Jew believed almost instinctively in ONE God. From the days of Moses, at least, the Judaic theology had this as the primary article of its Creed, ‘Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE Lord’ (Deut. vi. 4). The early heresies on this matter had their origin in the desire to answer the metaphysical question which so troubled men’s minds—*πότεν τὸ κακόν*. In order to account for the existence of evil they had recourse to the hypothesis of Dualism, and in this hypothesis the god who was the author of evil was represented as inferior to the author of good. Clearly, then, there was in their belief no Infinite Being, as two *equal* original causes could not be admitted into any system of theology, and much less two INFINITE causes. A real Unity could not therefore exist, according to the theories of the Dualists.

In the argument for the Unity of the First Cause, it is advantageous to distinguish between the ONENESS of our *idea* of Him, and the ONENESS of His *objective reality*. We have a ONENESS of idea about the existence of one human nature, though there exist millions of human beings. The term ‘Unity,’ therefore, when applied to the first cause, does not mean the oneness of our subjective idea of God as of a Divine nature, but it means the ONELINESS or uniqueness in number of the object to which the subjective idea refers. The idea of *one nature* remains the same whether we refer it to one object or to thousands, but the object of this idea is one Individual in number. It has frequently been discussed by philosophers and theologians whether Unity may be regarded as an attribute of the Godhead. As the Unity of the Divine essence is viewed, both in Natural Theology and in Revelation, as a negation opposed to Polytheism, *Unity is not an attribute* of the Deity, but is a mere idea of Him in relation to number, and is employed to limit and restrict both the name and the honour of Godhead to one Individual, instead of applying it, as the Polytheists do, to a multiplicity of beings. On the other hand, some of the Fathers and Schoolmen have represented Unity as a kind of transcendental attribute of God. When they said that

God was one, they did not mean that He was a mathematical Unity in the universe. Before the universe began to be, He was the only Being, He was one God. After the Creation His Unity was neither divided nor multiplied ; but He is still THE ONE. Were the universe annihilated, its extermination would leave His Unity, as it was at first, in the unapproachable solitude of its own grandeur.

Such were the conceptions of the ALL-ONENESS of God which prevailed, as we have said, among some of the Fathers and Schoolmen. The ascription by some of a numerical and mathematical Unity to God did not satisfy such minds, and they consequently attributed to Him a kind of supernal or transcendental Unitness. Plato had named Him the $\tau\acute{o}\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}$, THE ONE ; Pythagoras had his Monad ; but each was a pure abstraction, and neither a real and actual existence.

Contesting such philosophic abstractions, Christian divines maintained that God was $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$, beyond everything one ; and also $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu\ \mu\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha$, transcendently one, and one in a sense far surpassing that in which any monad is one. But we may observe with Schleiermacher ('Christliche Glaube,' sec. 56), 'IF UNITY BE TAKEN IN A STRICT SENSE, IT CANNOT BE ADMITTED AS AN ATTRIBUTE OF ANYTHING THAT IT EXISTS ONLY ONE IN NUMBER.' It is not the attribute of the hand to be two, but it is an attribute of man to have two hands, and of an ape to have four. Thus it may be an attribute of the universe that it is governed by one God only, but it is not an attribute of God that He is only one. In conceiving of the Divine attributes, we must omit number as being one of them, and then Unity will stand out as a general expression that God has no equal, a fact which is more clearly designated by the word ONELINESS.

But to consider the matter with more particular regard to the polytheism of the heathens. One reason which the polytheists gave for supporting a plurality of gods, was the apprehension that the work of creating, and the business of governing, a world of such magnitude and diversity, were too great for any one being. In confirmation of this, we may mention Epicurus, who, although the idea of God, including Unity or Oneliness in it, was known to him, yet asserted a

multiplicity of co-ordinate deities independent upon one Supreme. And he further concluded it would be a thing utterly impossible for the Deity to animadvert, order and dispose all things, and be present everywhere in all the distant places of the world at once. This could not be pretended of a multitude of co-ordinate gods sharing the government of the world amongst them. (*Cf.* Epicurus, book ii., ed. Lamb.) The same argument, says Cudworth, is pursued in Cicero, 'De Nat. Deorum,' book i.: 'Whether you will suppose the world itself to be a God, what can be more unquiet, than without intermission perpetually to whirl round upon the axis of the heaven with admirable celerity? Or whether you will imagine a God in the world distinct from it, who governs and disposes all things, keeps up the courses of the stars, the successive changes of the seasons, and orderly vicissitudes of things, and contemplating lands and seas, conserves the utilities and lives of men; certainly He must be involved in much solicitous trouble and employment.' The true and proper idea of God is in its most simple form this: a Being absolutely perfect.

Cudworth ('Intellectual Systems,' book i., cap. iv., p. 207) has this summary: 'God is a being absolutely perfect, unmade or self-originated, and necessarily existing; that hath an infinite fecundity in Him, and virtually contains all things; as also an infinite benignity or overflowing love, uninviciously displaying and communicating itself; together with an impartial rectitude or nature of justice; who fully comprehends Himself and the extent of His own fecundity, and therefore all the possibilities of things, their several natures and respects, and the best frame or system of the whole; who hath also an infinite active and perceptive power: the fountain of all things, who made all that could be made, producing them according to His own nature (His essential goodness and wisdom), and therefore according to the best pattern, and in the best manner possible, for the good of the whole; and reconciling all the variety and contrariety of things in the universe into one most admirable and lovely harmony. Lastly, who contains and upholds all things, and governs them after the best manner also, and that without any force or violence, they being all naturally subject to His authority, and readily obeying His law.'

There can be but one such Being. To such a Being *Μόνωσις*, Unity, ONELINESS or Singularity is essential, forasmuch as there cannot possibly be more than one omnipotent or infinitely powerful Being, and more than one Cause of all things besides itself. Moses Maimon ('De Fundam. Legis,' cap. i., 4) says: 'God is one, not two, or more than two, but only one: whose unity is not like to that of the individuals of this world; neither is He one by way of species comprehending many individuals; neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes; but He is so one, as no unity like His is to be found in the world.'

The difficulty which the heathen philosophers felt arose from their faulty conception of God. When the existence of ONE CAUSE is conceived as infinite, the difficulty which they felt respecting the creation and government of the world is disposed of, and every effect produced is accounted for satisfactorily. If the mind conceives of God as INFINITE, it finds an insuperable difficulty against admitting the existence of more than one God. This difficulty may arise from the abstruse nature of infinity. The only idea that the mind can form of infinity is, that it EXISTS, both in space and in duration. But we do not understand infinity, since there is nothing else like it, nothing else with which we can compare it. An objection is sometimes made against the doctrine of the Divine Unity that it is neither clear nor satisfactory, since it is only by revelation that man has been able to discover it. We must confess that there is much truth in this objection. And it is a striking and important circumstance in the history of the human mind, that the idea of one infinite, perfect God is neither so obvious, nor so pleasing to it, as either to be suggested by reason at first, or to be recovered by reason when that idea has been lost. The history of heathen philosophy gives abundant proof of this, as does also the constant proneness of the Israelites to fall into idolatry, notwithstanding the fact that to them had been communicated the revelation of the Unity of God. It is a universal fact, found in all places, and in all generations, that Reason and Science never have made the discovery that God is one. Now, however, after the Divine Unity has been announced by Revelation, both Reason and

Science conspire to demonstrate that that Unity is true. And the evidences of the fact of the Divine Unity are so clear that Reason and Science are surprised, and almost ashamed, for having been so long and so deep in the dark, upon a subject that, when once announced, appears so obvious.

The logic of the ancient sages compelled them to give some account of the wild diversity and accumulated multiplicity which they found in the phenomena presented to them, and this they did by assuming the existence of a plurality of gods that had exerted their different agencies in producing the complex results. But it is not literally true to say that the heathen philosophers were entirely destitute of every conception of the Unity of the Godhead. For in the works of the heathen poets and philosophers, we constantly find that they had the notion of a Supreme Deity, which they called the Father of gods and men. It is from the *usus loquendi* of the heathen populace that Tertullian deduces one argument for the Unity of God. Such phrases as 'Si Deus dederit' (If God grant it), 'Quod Deo placet' (What pleases God), and 'Deo commendo' (I commit it to God) were in constant use, and indicate that even among the vulgar, and with a prevailing polytheism, there was some notion of one Supreme Deity. That Plato had no distinct and certain conception of one God as a real entity, is evident from the 'Cratylus,' in which he openly recognises the grossest mythology of heathenism.

When Christianity was first preached to mankind the real religion—if we are permitted to use such an expression—of the Gentile world was polytheistic. As we have already seen, the idea of one God was not an unheard-of doctrine; in fact, in some degree it was still held in almost all lands, yet the Creed of the many was polytheism. They groped after God if haply they might find Him, though, in point of fact, He was not far from every one of them. So very frequently were they on the thin line of the borderland which divides truth from error that we wonder that this great truth and helpful doctrine of the Unity of God was not apparent to their reason. But for Revelation this great glory was reserved, that the fulness of the blessing might be of God, and not of men.

For even Aristotle, and others who, like him, had a fuller

and clearer perception and idea than their fellows of one self-existent Mind, which was a designing and Providential Wisdom, regulating everything by the law of the good and suitable—τὸ εὖ καὶ καλῶς, making good the final cause of everything, and order the means of attaining that end—even these fell very far short of the Christian or even Jewish idea of God, because that, although they could perceive to a certain extent the Unity of Design that pervaded the whole, yet allowed that a multiplicity of Divine Agents had been engaged in working out the entire results of creation. (Harvey, pp. 111-120.) Undoubtedly Aristotle perceived more of the truth than many of his fellows. Again, note the following from Plato, 'Phileb.,' cap. vii. : 'We may the better assert, as we have often done, that there is a cause beside these not inconsiderable, arranging and putting in order the years and hours and months, which may be most properly called Wisdom (Νοῦς) or Mind.'

And also Diodorus Siculus, xii., 84 : 'Above all, one must believe and be persuaded that there are gods, and in our mind examine the heavens, watching its arrangement and order.'

And yet again Plato, 'Leg.,' x., cap. i. : 'It seems easy, in very truth, to say that there are gods. In the first place, we have the earth and the sun and all the stars, and then the seasons so beautifully arranged and divided by years and months.'

And Plato, in another place, 'Rep.,' book x., speaks of 'one Supreme Creator of all things,' ὁ γῆν οὐρανὸν καὶ Θεοὺς, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν ᾧδον καὶ ὑπὸ ἅπαντα ἐργάζεται, and consistently with this in the 'Timæus,' he imagines the Supreme Creator to have addressed the subordinate divinities of heaven as His own creatures.

Cudworth ('Intellectual Systems of the Universe,' iv., 15), speaking of the early ages of Christianity, says : 'All along, during that fierce contest which was betwixt Christianity and paganism, none of the professed champions for paganism and antagonists of Christianity did ever assert any such thing as a multiplicity of understanding deities unmade' (or creators), 'but, on the contrary, they all generally disclaimed it, professing to acknowledge one Supreme Self-existent Deity, the Maker of the whole universe.' But we may urge,

on the other hand, that the heathen writers who attacked Christianity would very naturally present the best side of their own systems, and not the worst ; for was not Christianity gaining a hold upon the faith of the people which, at least for centuries, heathenism had not held? The case of paganism had become a desperate one, and every effort that could be made must be made to bolster up the dying and rapidly-failing cause. But it was all to no purpose. The old philosophies had failed, and signally, to convey to the souls of men that satisfactory idea of God which should give them peace. Glimmerings of the truth, as we have seen, did now and again emerge from behind the black clouds ; fitful gleams, and more or less erratic, telling of the glorious light that lay beyond ready to burst over a world upon the point of perishing from sheer hopelessness. Cosmogonies, Mythologies, Philosophies, these had each their day, but had each failed to bring man into personal contact with the Eternal God. Away back, far off in the mist of early mythology, there was a story in which Love figured as the primary Deity, and which was made to originate itself from Night and Chaos. It was, as Cudworth remarks, undoubtedly a relic of the Mosaic story, which lingered amongst men ; a recollection of the story of the brooding of the Spirit of God over the earth's chaos, bringing light and life to all. 'At that early period,' says Mr. Harvey (p. 121), 'the knowledge of the Unity of the Deity had not yet become extinct, but the Intellectual as a seductive spirit led men astray ; and they overlaid the truth with myths, which future generations were to accept as realities.' And thus it was that Polytheism became the Creed of the many. Brief, then, as the earliest Creeds of the Church were, they safeguarded the Faith, and asserted the true doctrine of the Unity of God. No man who accepted the Christian Creed could remain any longer a polytheist. For him henceforth there was one God, even the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ ; and with these one Holy Spirit ; not three Gods, or three phases of one God, but a Trinity in Unity who was to be worshipped.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE USE OF THE CREED IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

THE first use to which the Creed was put was in the preparation for the initiation of the catechumens by baptism into the Church. Baptism was usually administered at the seasons of Easter and Whitsuntide, and not at other times, except in cases of emergency. For a considerable time previously, the catechumens were under instruction in the doctrines of the Faith by the presbyters. Lectures were delivered to them on the doctrines of the Faith; the Creed of necessity, in the main, supplied the heads of the lectures. A good specimen of the style of lectures is to be found in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, which were delivered in the season of Lent, A.D. 348 (see Heurtley, 'De Fide et Symbolo,' for this). But while the lectures were on the doctrines of the Creed, the Creed itself was not taught them until just before baptism; then it was to be learned by heart and not committed to writing. St. Augustine, Sermon 212, says: 'I have given you, as in duty bound, this short discourse on the whole of the Creed, and you will observe that there is briefly collected into it whatever you have heard in the Creed. Nor ought you by any means to use writing that you may retain these same words of the Creed, but to learn them thoroughly by listening, nor when you have learnt them ought you to write them down, but ever to retain and recollect them by memory.' So, too, Petrus Chrysologus, already quoted (p. 9), and also St. Cyprian earlier, says that 'The sacrament of faith, *i.e.*, the Creed, is not to be profaned or divulged.' St. Ambrose, also, most pathetically exhorts to the utmost

vigilance to conceal the Christian mysteries, and in particular to be very 'careful not by incautiousness to reveal the secrets of the Creed or Lord's Prayer' (St. Ambrose, 'De Cain et Abel,' tom. iv., lib. i., cap. ix.).

The final part of the preparation for baptism was known as the *Traditio Symboli*, the delivery of the Creed. There seems to have been no settled rule as to the number of days set apart for this *Traditio Symboli*, but it varied according to circumstances, time, and place. In the French, Spanish, and Milanese Churches, the day appointed for the '*Traditio Symboli*' was Palm Sunday; in the Roman Church, the fourth Wednesday in Lent; in the African Church, the third Saturday in Lent (See Martene, '*De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*,' lib. i., cap. i., art. xi.). St. Ambrose (Epist. 35, lib. v.) thus describes this ceremony: 'On a Lord's Day, the Lessons and Sermons being ended, and the Catechumens of the lower rank dismissed, the Creed was delivered in the Baptistry of the Church to the *Competentes*.' The '*Competentes*' were the advanced catechumens, who would be presented for baptism forthwith. This '*Traditio Symboli*' was accompanied by a sermon explanatory of it, as that by St. Augustine quoted above; then on the day of baptism the candidates were each questioned as to their faith, and they answered in the words that had been taught them. Each candidate repeated the Creed in the words which had been given to him; this was the '*Redditio Symboli*.' The '*Redditio Symboli*' took place in the Roman Church on the morning of Easter Eve, as we learn from the '*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*,' (Muratori, tom. i., p. 563). In the African Church, the ceremony took place on the eighth day after the '*Traditio Symboli*' (see also Martene, as above). In the Apostolic Constitutions there is a description of this service. At the time of his baptism the catechumen declared: 'I believe in the only true God, the Father, the Almighty, And in His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, And in the Holy Ghost, the Life-Giver.' In Tertullian's time the catechumen professed his belief in the Three Persons of the Trinity, and, in addition, in *repentance*, remission of sins, and the Church. About A.D. 250 the Baptismal Creed of the Church of Carthage was interrogatory. The candidate for

baptism was questioned concerning his faith by the priest, who asked him :

1. Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth ?

Response : I believe.

2. Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son ?

Response : I believe.

3. Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, The remission of sins, The resurrection of the flesh, And everlasting life ?

Response : I believe.

The following form is from St. Ambrose, 'De Sacramentis,' lib. ii., cap. vii. In use at Milan, *circa* A.D. 380.

Interrogatus es,

Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem?—Dixisti,

Credo :

(Et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es.)

Iterum interrogatus es,

Credis in Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, Et in crucem ejus?—Dixisti, Credo :

(Et mersisti : ideo et Christo es consepultus.)

Tertio interrogatus es,

Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum?—Dixisti, Credo :

(Tertio mersisti, ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.)

The student may consult with benefit for other like forms Heurtley, 'Harmonia Symbolica,' pp. 109-112.

Tertullian says: 'Profession of renunciation was made when they were about to enter the water, there, and also previously in the church under the hand of the minister; then we are plunged three times into the water, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel' (Tertull., 'De Cor. Milit.,' cap. iii.). Baptism was the only occasion on which for several centuries the Creed was introduced into any public service of the Church.

CHAPTER V.

EARLIEST CREEDS—SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE.

LITTLE as we can learn from the New Testament records of the exact form of the Creed, we are in still worse plight when the scanty light which they afford us is withdrawn. A literal interpretation of St. Paul's instruction to 'guard the deposit,' and the necessity of the times, operated so effectually as to deprive us of the pleasure of having an unbroken record. The Creed was only formally recited at baptism, and as a form of words had not as yet come to be regarded as the '*norma prædicationis*.' It was kept as a profound secret, and we have to travel well on into the second century before we can be certain that an author is quoting the Creed. We say 'certain,' because, although some articles which now appear in the Creed are rehearsed in earlier writers, it appears certain from the context that they are not intentionally quoting from an adopted Confession of Faith. Mr. Wigan Harvey, '*History of the Creeds*,' pp. 34, 35, endeavoured to show that, in his Epistle to the Philippians, St. Polycarp was quoting a Creed. The passage referred to is Polycarp, '*Ad Philip.*,' ii., and is as follows: 'Wherefore, girding up the loins of your mind, serve the Lord with fear, and in truth; laying aside all empty and vain speech, and the error of many; believing in Him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and hath given Him glory and a throne at His right hand; to whom all things are made subject, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; whom every living creature shall worship; who shall come to be the Judge of the quick and dead.' And again, the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Trallians, cap. ix., has been quoted as an example of a Creed. It is as follows:

'Stop your ears, therefore, as often as anyone shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary; who was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the dead by His Father, after the manner as He will also raise up us who believe in Him, by Christ Jesus, without whom we have no true life.'

Without attempting to minimize the importance of these witnesses to doctrines held in the Church at that early date, we must, nevertheless, record our conviction that in neither case is a Creed being quoted, but that it is the heresy of the Docetists that is being combated; since these early heretics asserted that the Son of God did not take a human body in reality, but only 'in seeming.' In the passage quoted above from Ignatius, 'Epist. ad Tralls,' it will be seen that the writer confines himself to an earnest defence of the doctrines of the Church concerning the Incarnation. He does not even mention the Holy Spirit; and this he would undoubtedly have done had he been quoting the Creed. So, too, Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 13.

Passing from these sub-Apostolic authors, we next come (A.D. 155) to Justin Martyr. Justin was a man of great intelligence, and after his conversion a most energetic and able advocate of Christianity. We are now on surer ground, for it is in his works, according to Bishop Pearson ('Exposition of the Creed,' Art. Holy Ghost), that we find the first enlargement and explication of the Creed, thus expressed:

[Ἐπονομάζεται] τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα· καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα ὃ φωτιζόμενος λούεται (Justin, 'M. Apol.,' i. sec. 61).

It has indeed been said 'that Justin, in his first "Apology," quotes the doctrines of the Creed as methodically as the statements of the Creed itself' (Harvey, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 41)

But Professor Lumby ('History of the Creeds,' pp. 20, 21) says that the Creed of IRENÆUS is the first to which we can fix a date. In any case, the work of Irenæus was not published till after A.D. 178. The latest date assigned to Justin's first 'Apology' is A.D. 150 or 151; although by most writers it is regarded as having been published from A.D. 138 to 140 (*cf.* Robertson's 'History of the Christian Church,' vol. i., p. 31).

From Justin, the first of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, we pass to one whose life and works have for us a far more than passing interest. He is a connecting-link between East and West. He belongs in part to the Apostolic age and he belongs as well to the age in which development of Church doctrine began to take definite shape. He is of all the more interest to us in that in his works he makes mention of Celts, and it is *generally* believed that by Celts he means the inhabitants of our own islands. Professor Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 21, says: 'To an Englishman it can never be uninteresting to reflect that the Celts mentioned were probably the inhabitants of our own islands.' This writer was Irenæus. The Church of Lyons underwent great persecution in A.D. 177, and as a result of the treatment he received during that persecution, Pothinus, who had been bishop of that Church for many years, died at the age of upwards of ninety years. Irenæus, at that time a presbyter of the Church of Lyons, was chosen to succeed Pothinus in the bishopric. He was a man of great energy and earnestness; his habits of thought were more Eastern than Western, as we shall see when we recite the Creed put forth by him after he became bishop, for the instruction of the churches of Southern Gaul. In his great work against all heresies, lib. iii., cap. iii., Irenæus tells us how he spake with Polycarp, who was taught by the Apostles, and was Bishop of Smyrna, and conversed with many which saw our Saviour. The passage below will be found in St. Irenæus, 'Contra Hær.,' book i., cap. x., sec. 1; edit. Nicol. Gallasii, Paris, 1570:

'For the Church, though scattered through the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, yet having received from the apostles and their disciples the faith in one God the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth, and the

seas, and all that is in them ; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation ; and in the Holy Ghost, who preached through the prophets the dispensations (of old time), and the advents (of Jesus Christ, as, *e.g.*, the "Lord" who visited Abraham), and His birth of a virgin ; and His suffering ; and His rising from the dead ; and the ascension in the flesh of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ into heaven ; and His coming from heaven in the glory of the Father, for the consummation of all things, and to raise up all flesh of the whole human race,' etc. He goes on to mention that everywhere the Faith is one and the same, whether in Germany, Spain, among the Celts, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Libya, or in the middle parts of the world. 'For as the sun, God's creature, is one and the same in all the world, so, too, the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men who wish to come to the knowledge of the truth. . . . For as the faith is one and the same, neither he who is very able to speak on it adds thereto, nor does he who is less powerful diminish therefrom' (Quoted by Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 24). In book iii., cap. iv., of the same work our author refers to the Crucifixion, and fixes the date by using words which are to be found in both the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—'Suffered under Pontius Pilate.' Yet a third Creed is to be found in book iv., cap. xxxiii., sec. 7, of the same work, which is still shorter in form, and which, as the late Professor Heurtley observed, seems to have been framed on the model of 1 Cor. viii. 6 : 'There is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and we in Him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him' (*cf.* Heurtley's 'Harmonia Symbolica,' p. 13).

Πάντα συνέστηκεν

Εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, πίστις ὁλόκληρος· καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ δι' ὃν ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, πεισμονὴ βεβαία· καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, etc.

Passing on from St. Irenæus, we come next to forms of Creed in use in another branch of the Church, viz., the Church of North Africa. Here was a Latin-speaking

Church, and where old forms of words that were obsolete at Rome still lingered and were in use.

Provincialisms also are often observed in the writers whose works have come down to us from that province. One of these is Tertullian, who was a very prominent figure in the Church at Carthage until about the middle age of life, *i.e.*, about A.D. 198. He was perhaps the most eminent man the Church had seen since the days of the Apostles (Robertson, 'Ch. Hist.,' vol. i., p. 109). After his conversion he became a presbyter of the Church, and in that character resided both at Carthage and at Rome ('Tillemont,' iii., 198, 654, 655). According to St. Jerome, 'De Virgin. Veland. Illustr.' cap. liii., it was the envy of the Roman clergy that drove Tertullian to embrace the errors of Montanism. There is considerable dispute respecting the dates in connection with Tertullian. Dr. Pusey dates his conversion from heathenism to Christianity in A.D. 196, and his lapse to Montanism in A.D. 201 ('Introduction to Tertull.,' Oxford translation, p. ii.). In Cave, 'Hist. Lit.,' i. 91, the dates are respectively A.D. 185 and 199. The quotations given below are, it is believed, from works written previously to his lapse into Montanism. It was at one time believed that Tertullian's provincialisms were Punic, but Neander ('Antignost.,' xiii.) quotes the high opinion of Niebuhr that they are purely Latin archaisms. There are no less than three forms of the Creed in the works of Tertullian, and it is with him, as we have before quoted, 'the rule of faith.' The wording is not identical in the three forms, so that when he says ('De Virgin. Veland.,' cap. i.), 'Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola, immobilis et irreformabilis,' we are certain that he means not in exact words, but in sense and doctrine.

The following form is from 'Adv. Praxeam.,' cap. ii.: 'Nos vero et semper, et nunc magis ut instructiores per Paracletum, deductorem scilicet omnis veritatis, Unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione quam *οικονομίαν* dicimus, et unci Dei sit et Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem et ex ea natum, hominem et Deum filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum, hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum, *secundum scripturas*, et resuscitatum

a Patre et in cœlo resumptum, sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos; qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Hanc regulam ab initio evangelii decucurrisse, etiam ante priores quosque hæreticos, nedum ante Praxeam hesternum, probabit tam ipsa posteritas omnium hæreticorum, quam ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni.'

We may note that the phrase 'According to the Scriptures,' now in the Nicene Creed, was part of the Confession of Faith as early as the days of Tertullian. A shorter form of the Creed occurs in Tertull., 'De Virg. Vel.,' cap. i. It is as follows: 'Regula quidem fidei una omnino est sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem mundi conditorem, et filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem.'

The longest form which occurs in Tertullian's works is translated by Professor Lumby, p. 26, and runs thus: ('De Præscript. Hæret.,' cap. xiii.): 'The rule of faith is that whereby we believe that there is really one God and no other but the Creator of the world, who produced all out of nothing by His Word sent forth first of all things. That Word is called His Son, who, under the name of God, appeared in many ways to the patriarchs, was always heard in the prophets, and at last descended through the Spirit and power of God the Father into the Virgin Mary; and was made flesh in her womb, and born of her, and lived as Jesus Christ. Then He preached a new law, and a new promise of the kingdom of heaven; He worked miracles, was fastened to the Cross, rose again the third day, was taken up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father. He sent in His stead the power of the Holy Spirit to influence believers, and will come with glory to take His holy ones into the enjoyment of life eternal and the promises of heaven, and to adjudge the wicked to eternal fire, after a revival of both body and soul with the resurrection of the flesh.' If we add to this a short quotation from Tertull.,

‘De Baptismo,’ cap. vi., we shall have a fairly complete Creed: ‘Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignentur, necessario adjicitur ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.’

It is here that we have the first clear mention made of the Article of the Church forming part of the Creed. Fifty years after this, *circa* A.D. 250, the episcopal throne of the Church of Carthage was filled by St. Cyprian. The Creed which he quotes is very brief. Probably he quoted only just so much of the Creed as served his purpose. But we know from other places in his writings that the Creed at that time and place was longer than that which St. Cyprian quotes; as, *e.g.*, in his Epist. 76, sec. 6, ‘Ad Magnum,’ in which he writes against the Novatian schism, he remarks: ‘Nam cum dicunt; Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam? mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.’ And, again, in an epistle to Januarius: ‘Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam? intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in ecclesia dari.’ The Creed had already in Tertullian’s day undergone some expansion, as we learn from Tertull., ‘De Cor. Milit.’ cap. iii.; *cf.* also Heurtley, ‘Harmonia Symbolica,’ pp. 19, 20: ‘Denique ut a baptisinate ingrediar, aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu, contestamur nos renuntiare diabolo et pompæ et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergimur amplius aliquid respondentem quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit.’ This passage seems to point to a Creed to which, as yet, no definite form had been given. As we have before pointed out, it was St. Cyprian who first used the term *Σύμβολον* to designate the Creed (see Cyprian, Epist. 76, ‘Ad Magnum’).

Before we take leave of these two African writers, let us remind ourselves of the articles contained in the forms of Creed recited in their works. We must remember also that it is a Western Creed (although Tertullian’s forms have some things which are Eastern in character), and consequently shorter in form than if it had been for use in Oriental churches. Rufinus, ‘Expos. Symbol. Apost.’, sec. 3, in accounting for the shorter forms in use in Rome, as com-

pared with those which were received by other Churches, says that the Church there was less troubled by heresies. And Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 29, says: 'This is easy to be understood. In even earlier times the intellect of the Latin race was practical rather than speculative, and her sons loved feats of prowess rather than subtleties of philosophy.' If, therefore, we add to the Creed of Tertullian those articles found in the writings of St. Cyprian, we shall have a form of words very nearly resembling that Symbol which eventually merged in itself all other Western forms. Only two articles are wanting to complete the Apostles' Creed as we know it, viz., The descent into hell, and The Communion of saints. These two articles appear not to have been admitted to the Creeds of the Church of North Africa. Following in historical order, the Creed which next comes under our notice is that of the Church of Alexandria, as it existed in the early days of Origen. The work of Origen in which this Creed occurs is entitled *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, 'On first principles.' It was written before A.D. 231. The original Greek has been lost, but a Latin translation of it by Rufinus still remains.

The Creed of Origen may be thus translated: 'The preaching of the Apostles is this. There is one God, who created all things, and caused the whole universe to exist out of nothing: and that this God in the last days sent our Lord Jesus Christ. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Himself gave the law and the prophets, and the Gospels, and He also is the God of the Apostles, and of the Old and New Testament. Jesus Christ . . . was born of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost, and was made man. He suffered, and died, and rose from the dead, and was taken up. The Holy Ghost is united in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son' (Origen, 'De Principiis,' book i., cap. iv.). The date of this work is *circa* A.D. 210. Passing from the Creed of Origen, the next that claims our attention is one which we may well call a reflection of Origen's teaching, inasmuch as it was set forth by one of his pupils. Whilst Origen was teaching at Cæsarea, he had among his pupils two brothers, natives of Pontus. To these Origen imparted instruction, not only in classics, but also in Christian doctrine; and one

of these pupils, Gregory, who was afterwards called Thaumaturgus, on leaving for his home in Pontus, composed an oration in honour of his master, from whom he had learned so much. In this oration he included a Creed. It is very distinctly an Eastern Creed, rhetorical, and, as was to be expected from the pupil of so gifted a teacher as Origen, subtle and philosophical. It is of the same nature with the book in which it is contained, and was not intended to be used as a Creed in the Church. It is a summary of Christian doctrines, which the writer, having learned from his master, in the fulness of his gratitude wished to recount in the most eloquent manner possible. Yet this Creed of Gregory's helps us to see something of the process of development which the Confession of Faith underwent, and how the way was prepared for the acceptance, by the Council of Nicæa, of the fullest and most complete form which up to that time had been known. But this Creed of Gregory's did more than prepare the way for the acceptance of the Nicene Symbol: it actually made much preparation for the acceptance of the fuller form at the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. For in the latter portion the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and his equality of Godhead with the Father and the Son, are very strongly insisted upon. And while Gregory did not intend to set forth a Creed which should be a model for the Church, and to be used as a Confession of Faith, yet this undoubtedly did happen. We are not masters of our own destinies, and the Creed of Gregory was held in high esteem a hundred years later, when St. Basil the Great was bishop of the same see in which Gregory so distinguished himself, and St. Basil speaks of him with great veneration and respect (*cf.* Basil, 'Mag. de Spiritu Sancto,' sec. 74, and Epist. 75).

Gregory's Creed, which is to be found in Gregory, 'Orat. Panegyric. in Origen,' is as follows:

'There is one God—

'The Father of the living Word, of the subsisting wisdom and power, and of Him who is His eternal express image. The perfect Father of Him that is perfect; the Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, the only Son of the only Father; God of God; the Character and Image of the Godhead; the energetic Word; the comprehensive Wisdom

by which all things were made, and the power that gave being to all Creation. The true Son of the true Father; the Invisible of the Invisible; the Incorruptible of the Incorruptible; the Immortal of the Immortal; the Eternal of the Eternal. There is one Holy Ghost, having His existence from God, who was manifested through the Son clearly to men; the perfect Image of the perfect Son; the Life and the source of Life; the holy Fountain; Sanctity, and the promoter of Sanctification; by whom is made manifest God the Father, who is above all and in all, and God the Son, who is through all. A perfect Trinity, which, neither in glory, eternity, nor dominion, is separate or divided.'

The memorials concerning Gregory which have been preserved in antiquity are very scanty, but some stories have a peculiar interest. It is said that when he entered upon his work there were but seventeen Christians in the diocese, and that at his death there were only seventeen idolaters. Macrina, the grandmother of St. Basil Magnus and Gregory Nyssen, used to tell them the very words she had herself heard Gregory Thaumaturgus speak, and we are assured by St. Basil Magnus that the Gentiles, on account of the miracles which he performed, used to call him a second Moses. The last service which is recorded of him is the part which he took in the Council of Antioch, A.D. 269, whereat the doctrinal errors of Paul of Samosata were condemned.

Let us now turn again Westward, and inquire as to the form which the Creed had at this time assumed in the Roman Church. We may take it that whatever form is to be found in that Church at this early age will fairly represent the Creeds of all the Churches of Western Christendom. The materials available are exceedingly scanty, and it is really from the work of a schismatic that we get our information, and this work is the only means which remains to us of connecting the Roman Church of early times with the Western Creed (*cf.* Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 118). Fortunately, the schism which Novatian caused was not caused by a departure from the ancient doctrine, but by questions of discipline. Novatian, from whose work 'De Trinitate' the quotation given below is taken, is said by

some to have been originally a Stoic. At all events, he had received a philosophic education, and was of a morose and gloomy temper and disposition. He became a presbyter of the Church of Rome about A.D. 250, and among the Roman clergy who exchanged correspondence with Cyprian on the subject of his withdrawal from Carthage during a period of persecution, and on the treatment of the lapsed, Novatian was eminent for eloquence and learning. During a vacancy of the Sec of Rome, owing to the martyrdom of Fabian in January, A.D. 250, and which vacancy was not filled until June in the following year, Novatian exercised great influence in Rome. Cornelius was elected to the vacant See in June, 251, and Novatian allowed himself, in an irregular fashion, to be consecrated by some bishops of obscure sees, in opposition to Cornelius—hence the Novatian schism. Professor Lumby must be wrong in his date here (see his 'History of the Creeds,' p. 29). He says: 'Novatian . . . was at first a presbyter at Rome, about A.D. 260.' Now, St. Cyprian of Carthage wrote against the Novatian schism, and St. Cyprian was martyred A.D. 258; besides, Fabian was martyred in A.D. 250, and Cornelius was elected to fill his place in June, A.D. 251, and about the same time Novatian was consecrated bishop in opposition. Professor Lumby's date should be A.D. 250. Soon after June A.D. 251, Novatian was joined by one Novatus, from Carthage. Strange to say that he who at Carthage had vehemently opposed the strict discipline of the bishop and Church, at Rome adopted the directly opposite course, and was a champion of severity and rigour against those who had lapsed. Novatian and Novatus joined hands, and Novatian having been consecrated a bishop, and a schism thereby caused, they proceeded to act as if the consecration had been regular and lawful. Here was the first foundation of the Puritans—they called themselves Cathari, or Puritans. That the question was not one of doctrine, but of discipline, is clear from the answer of Acesius, a Novatianist bishop, who was present at the Nicene Council, A.D. 325, and being asked by the Emperor whether he assented to the Creed then accepted, and to the determination of the Council respecting the time of Easter, replied that both were in accordance with what he had always held as matter

of apostolical tradition. Neither Eusebius nor Socrates regarded Novatian as a heretic, but only as the advocate of a stricter form of discipline. Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' book iv. cap. xxviii., says : *Ναυάτος μὲν οὖν εἰ καὶ περὶ πολιτείας ἀκριβοῦς διεκρίθη, ἀλλ' οὖν γε τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτὴν οὐ μετέθηκεν.* Eusebius may also be consulted ('Hist. Eccl.,' book vi., cap. xliii.). The Creed which may be gathered from Novatian, 'De Trinitate,' is as follows: 'Regula exigit veritatis ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem. Etiam in Filium Dei, Christum Jesum Dominum Deum nostrum. Etiam in Spiritum Sanctum.' This is given rather disjointedly, being collected from caps. i., ix., and xxix. of the above work.

From this time to the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, we have no authentic record of Creeds put forth by either branch of the Church. Those which occur in the 'Acts of the Saints' are, as Professor Lumby observes (p. 120), far too elaborate in character to admit of their being accepted as of the date to which they lay claim. There is another Creed which claims to be of a date anterior to A.D. 325, but which was not published or presented for acceptance to any council until the Council of Antioch, held in A.D. 341. This Creed was asserted by those who there presented it to have been composed and drawn up by Lucian, a presbyter at Antioch, and who suffered martyrdom under Maximinus, A.D. 311. It was stated that this Creed had been found in manuscript, and that it was the very writing of Lucian, who had been martyred in Nicomedia. The object of its presentation in A.D. 341 was to get it substituted for the Symbol which had been adopted by the Council of the Three Hundred and Eighteen Fathers. So that, although it was asserted to have been in existence for at least fifty years at the time when it was first made public, considering the mode and object of its presentation, we will reserve consideration of it till we come to trace the history of the Nicene Symbol.

CHAPTER VI.

RECAPITULATION.

IN bringing this portion of our work to a conclusion, we may just recount and present in summary form the results of our investigations up to this point.

We have seen that

1. No categorical Creed was in use by the Apostles, or it would have been rehearsed in some of their writings. But although there is no concrete form of words recorded in Holy Scripture as being demanded of all candidates for baptism, yet the agreement of all the most ancient forms of Creed to which we can refer leads us to believe that from the earliest time some form of sound words was agreed upon by the leaders of the Church. And it is in Holy Scripture that we are to look for the *θεμέλιον* of the Creed; and although the forms used might vary somewhat in exact wording, as Tertullian's works clearly show that they did, yet in all cases a declaration of faith in the Three Persons of the Trinity was demanded from those who were candidates for admission into the Christian Society. The earliest forms were undoubtedly very simple, and most probably contained nothing more than the confession of the catechumen's faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But at the same time, facts which now stand as integral parts of the Creed were of necessity related by the first preachers of Christianity, and required to be believed by those who wished to enter the Christian Society.

2. For several reasons the Christian Creed was kept secret from all but those who were admitted into membership with the Church, and even these were instructed not to

commit it to writing, but to retain it in their memories as they had been taught. It may be that St. Paul's injunction to St. Timothy to 'guard the deposit' influenced the early successors of the Apostles to keep secret the Creed; or it may be that the profanity of heathen writers and caricaturists and opponents of Christianity led to the preservation from vulgar eyes and ears of that which was the expression in words of the heart's best worship and adoration of the Divine; or it may be that, anxious to preserve their spiritual *imperium in imperio* intact, and that each member of the Society might be able to recognise a brother member anywhere, they adopted as a watchword the confession of their faith, whereby Christians were known to Christians, as distinguished from heathens. This latter use seems more likely, since the Christians of the Catacombs had their watchword, and used the symbol $\iota\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, and by it, or the sign of a fish, Christians discovered themselves to Christians, and professed their faith in Jesus Christ as God.

3. It was not until heresy and error attacked the Church's doctrine that additions were made to the simple formula. The Church did not desire for her own sake the fuller and more developed forms of the expression of her faith; but as heresy after heresy arose, and errors in doctrinal teaching were discovered, the Church, rightly interpreting St. Paul's words, took measures to guard the sacred deposit of Divine truth committed to her keeping. But in doing this, she added nothing to 'the deposit.' The faith had always been possessed in its fulness, and the developments which took place were not developments in the sense of originality, but only by way of definition and explanation. And the Creed of the later age is not in reality distinct from or more extensive than the Creed of the Apostolic age. The whole of the Creed of the Western Church may be constructed from the writings of St. Paul alone. As the late Canon Liddon (Bampton Lectures, p. 359) says: 'A belief may be professed, either by stating it in terms, or by acting in a manner which necessarily implies that you hold it. A man may profess a Creed with which his life is at variance, but he may also live a Creed, if I may so speak, which he has not the desire nor the skill to put into exact words. Until I am challenged . . . there is no necessity for my putting

into words an opinion which has already been stated in the language of action and with such unmistakable decision.'

4. The development was gradual. As heresy and paganism challenged the Church's doctrines, the true faith and real belief of the Church were expressed and defined. And in all cases an appeal was confidently made to the Apostolic age. When Polytheism and Gnosticism attacked Christianity, the latter asserted as the true doctrine the Unity of God; and when the Cerinthians and Docetæ maintained that our Lord did not take a real human body, we find St. Ignatius vehemently asserting the orthodox doctrine that it was *οὐ δόκησις*, but, in reality, that the Saviour was born of Mary the Virgin, and truly ate and drank, and truly suffered and died. St. Justin Martyr lays particular stress upon the Resurrection. St. Irenæus, for the guidance of the faithful, put forth a Creed containing all the main facts of Christianity, and this, he declares, is the faith received from the Apostles and their disciples. Tertullian, at the end of the second century, earnestly champions the doctrines of Christianity, and speaks of a *regulam veritatis*, which has come down from the commencement of the Gospel. The teaching of the Apostles is *regula fidei*. Origen voluminously asserted the Christian doctrines. Gregory Thaumaturgus recounted what he had been taught as from Apostolic days. St. Cyprian, in North Africa, fifty years after Tertullian, has the same *rule of faith*. Novatian, at Rome, declared 'the rule of faith and truth.'

And the sum of it all is this :

We are in the last quarter of the third century; Christianity is still a *religio illicita* throughout the Roman Empire; the most diabolical cruelties which Satanic ingenuity could devise, or the hate of man could employ, have been, and are being, used in persecution of the Christians; the Christian doctrines have been travestied, challenged, and contested; foes have attacked from without, and heresy has troubled within. Yet amid all these the Church has faithfully guarded the original deposit of 'sound words' committed to her trust; she has carefully defined the doctrines of Holy Scripture, and built up against the attacks of heresy a wall of defence of such strength and stability that, when the supreme test shall come, and the most powerful, the

most determined, and most prolonged antagonism to the ancient faith shall present itself at her doors, she will be able to meet and defeat it by an appeal to her unvarying, unalterable, and unchanging belief in the perfect equality of Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And as the third century closed in amid scenes portentous, and the secret of the near triumph of the long-suffering and grievously persecuted Church lay securely wrapped in the future, those who were gifted to read the signs of the times failed not to perceive that 'the mystery of iniquity' was preparing for a conflict more fierce, more bitter, and more prolonged than any that had gone before. Few, probably, they were who, in the hush that preceded that fateful storm, foresaw the literal fulfilment of the Master's words—'A man's foes shall be they of his own household.' Diocletian may destroy the sacred Scriptures, but the truth has been written upon the fleshy tables of the hearts of those whom the doctrines have purified. And the doctrines will not die; they are God's Everlasting Verities, and can never perish; the troubler of Israel will arise from within, and for a century a struggle most bitter, and a warfare in which dialectical subtlety and strategy will put forth the utmost of their powers in antagonism will have to be sustained by the Spouse of Christ. But the issue of the conflict will be a faith defined and clear, against which the storms and tempests of error will beat evermore in vain. Little by little the armour has been buckled on, and the Church can in confidence meet the foe, and eventually secure for the true Faith an absolute and permanent victory. The Creed which she will be able to present as the summary of the orthodox and true Faith against the heresy of Arius will be the bulwark of Christian belief in all the future ages.

As we look back at it now at this distance of nearly sixteen centuries, we observe that the Creed which was accepted by the Nicene Council, A.D. 325, was no novelty. All that it contained had been accepted and held in the Church all along, with the exception of those two phrases that were specially designed to guard against the Arian heresy. These were ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς and ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ. To prevent the insertion of these terms—which were not to be found in the Scripture, but which safeguarded

the Scripture doctrine—the Arians offered the most strenuous and violent opposition. But to them the orthodox party stood firm, and in so doing saved the Church from the awful blasphemy of declaring the Son of God to be a creature, and humanity—the world—from the awful catastrophe which must of necessity have followed—viz., the shock of a disappointed, a blasted, and a ruined hope.

CHAPTER VII.

CONDEMNATION OF ARIANISM.

Striving . . . for the faith of the Gospel.'—PHIL. i. 27.

THE storm had broken at last. The peace of the Church was mightily disturbed. What marvels one man may work when he is in earnest! Arius was in earnest; he had persuaded himself upon particular doctrines, and he disseminated his heretical teaching as widely and as persistently as possible. Arius was a man of good learning, skilled in logic and all the improvements of the human mind which were in that age the constituents of a liberal education. He occupied an important post in the Church of Alexandria, which gave him greater opportunities of spreading his pernicious error than he would have had in most other Churches. For he was a presbyter—advanced to the priesthood by Achillas, who succeeded Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, Peter being martyred under the last Diocletian persecution. In the Alexandrian Church each presbyter had a congregation of his own—was, in fact, a parish priest with a parochial charge. It is easy to see how, under such circumstances, false doctrine and heresy would have an excellent chance of growing and of being fostered and fomented by its author. Arius was, moreover, a skilled dialectician, and was immensely popular as a preacher. There were many in Alexandria then who had itching ears. Arius had a strong friend in Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was a friend of the Emperor's. When the doctrines taught by Arius became known to his diocesan, and practices which were by no means loyal to his bishop were reported whilst he was yet in the diaconate, his bishop, Peter of Alexandria, had to

suspend him from the exercise of his office. Achilles succeeded Peter for a brief space, and during his episcopate Arius was restored, and subsequently advanced to the priesthood. But he could not rest, and he loved to speculate on points of doctrine on which the Church had not made any definite pronouncement. But the teaching of Arius will soon cause such a conflict that it will be necessary for the Church to declare her unalterable belief in the Divinity of the second Person of the Trinity. For, as Mr. Gwatkin ('The Arian Controversy,' p. 7) says: 'The Arian Christ is nothing but a heathen idol invented to maintain a heathenish Supreme in heathen isolation from the world.' It was against such heathenism as this that the Church had struggled long, and was destined now to have to contend against within her own fold and among her own members. Arius popularized his teaching by using telling arguments, and by composing a large number of theological songs for sailors, and millers, and wayfarers. Thus the error spread. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, did all he could to stop it, but Arius more than held his own against him. Alexander summoned a synod of bishops, who met at Alexandria. The heresy of Arius was examined and condemned, and he, with nine of his adherents, were expelled from the Church. The Emperor intervened, for the thing had become a great scandal, and Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, was sent to Alexandria to try and make up the breach. But all in vain. It was not in the power of those who loved both truth and peace to sacrifice the former to the latter, consistently with a good conscience, however sincerely desirous they must have been of promoting both; for the object of contention was not a trifle or insignificant, but a fundamental doctrine of the faith. The mission of Hosius having failed, the Emperor, Constantine Magnus, resolved to summon the aid of the whole Christian Church, and the result of this resolution was the assembling of the first Œcumenical Council at Nicæa in Bithynia in A.D. 325. The number of bishops who assembled at this council from all parts of the Christian world is stated by Athanasius to have been three hundred and eighteen. The attendants on the bishops—priests and deacons—swelled the number to, probably, about six hundred. Harmony and peace and love were

not the all-pervading spirits at this council. Mutual recriminations of one kind and another were presented to the Emperor, who very wisely did not examine these complaints, but burnt them, and reprimanded those who had presented them. With the other questions of Church polity and other matters we have nothing to do; the Council of Nicæa is of interest and value to us in that there was discussed, and, so far as the Catholic and Orthodox Church was concerned, was settled for all time, the Church's faith regarding the Godhead of Jesus Christ. But the struggle was a severe one, and every effort was put forth by the Arianizing party to prevent the insertion in the Creed of the unscriptural terms which guarded the all-important truth. The very fact that the Arians struggled so hard against them was almost sufficient reason in itself for endeavouring to get them inserted. Athanasius, with marvellous literary acumen and dialectical skill, fought the opponents of the doctrine of the true Divinity of Jesus Christ. The peace-at-any-price members of the council were of course for making a compromise. Eusebius, the courtly Bishop of Cæsarea, presented a Creed together with an Epistle. This Creed, he said, he had received before and at his baptism, and 'these doctrines we stedfastly maintain, and avow our full confidence in truth of them; such also have been our sentiments hitherto, and such we shall continue to hold until death; and in an unshaken adherence to this faith, we anathematize every impious heresy.'

THE CREED OF EUSEBIUS PRESENTED TO THE NICENE COUNCIL, A.D. 325.

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible:—and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, born before all creation (*Πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*), begotten of the Father before all ages; by whom also all things were made; who on account of our salvation became incarnate, and lived among men; and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again in

glory to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Spirit. [We believe in the existence and subsistence of each of these Persons: that the Father is truly Father, the Son truly Son, and the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit; even as our Lord also, when He sent forth His disciples to preach the Gospel, said, Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. These doctrines we thus stedfastly maintain, and avow our full confidence in the truth of them; such also have been our sentiments hitherto, and such we shall continue to hold until death: and in an unshaken adherence to this faith, we anathematize every impious heresy. In the presence of God Almighty, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, we testify that thus we have believed and thought from our heart and soul since we were capable of forming a judgment on the matter, and have possessed a right estimate of ourselves; and that we now think and speak what is perfectly in accordance with the truth. We are, moreover, prepared to prove to you, by undeniable evidences, and to convince you that in time past we have thus believed, and so preached.']

It will be noticed that in this declaration of Belief Eusebius did not include any clauses relating to the Church, Baptism, etc. But it would be rash to assume that because they were omitted in this declaration that they did not therefore exist either in the Cæsarean or other similar formularies. 'It is more likely that Eusebius presented only so much of his native Creed as related to the Persons of the Godhead as sufficient for the special purpose of the Council; and that the Council kept within the same lines' (Dr. Hort, p. 60).

The Creed thus offered by Eusebius for acceptance was the basis of the Creed eventually promulgated by the Nicene Council, and it was probably accepted as a basis, not on account of its being the Creed of the Church of Cæsarea, nor because it was presented by Eusebius, but because it was, on the points which it touched, a summary, and a correct summary, of the faith and teaching of the Church from the earliest age. It expressed the Church's true belief, and it was only necessary to add the proper safeguards against the new error. Nevertheless, it is of importance to

state here that 'this document, although of orthodox appearance, was so artfully framed as to evade the very questions which it was the business of the Council to determine. He censured the terms proposed by the Catholics as not being scriptural—a futile objection, inasmuch as the matter in dispute was the SENSE of those Scriptures which all professed to accept, and somewhat shameless, as coming from a party which had opened the controversy by the introduction of terms unknown to Scripture' (Robertson, 'History of Christian Church,' vol. i., p. 292). For the term *ὁμοούσιος* had been used by Paul of Samosata, and it is generally believed that at the Council of Antioch, held A.D. 269, the Church, being satisfied that Paulus used the word in a mischievous and heterodox sense, set it aside (*cf.* Liddon, Bampton Lectures, vii., 431, 432).

In the end the Council of Nicæa drew up a Creed 'resembling that of Eusebius, and, like it, mainly derived from the older forms of the Eastern Church, but differing from it by the necessary safeguards against the Arian errors; and this Creed, with a solemn condemnation of Arius, was generally signed by the Bishops, among the rest by Eusebius himself, whose adhesion, as explained in a letter to his flock, was more creditable to his ingenuity than to his candour' (Robertson, 'History of Christian Church,' vol. i., p. 292). The first name among the subscribers to the Creed drawn up with authority of this General Council is that of Hosius of Cordova. 'So I believe as above written,' wrote Hosius. The Bishop of Rome was not present at the Council, but was represented by two priests. Next after the signature of Hosius these two priests signed for their absent Bishop—'So we have subscribed for our Bishop, who is the Bishop of Rome. So he believes as is above written.' Two Bishops signed the Creed, but not the Anathema. These were Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nicæa. Two Egyptian Bishops, Theonas and Secundus, persistently refused to sign, and, with Arius, were banished to Illyria. The Emperor ordered that the followers of Arius should be styled PORPHYRIANS, and that the writings of Arius should be burnt. Thus ended, so far as the history of the Nicene Creed is concerned, the FIRST ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL of the Church. But the end of the

controversy was not yet. Below we give the text of the true Nicene Creed :

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα
παντοκράτορα,
πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων
ποιητὴν.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν
Χριστόν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς
μονογενῆ.
τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ
πατρὸς·

Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀλη-
θινοῦ,

γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί,

δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε
ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ
γῇ·

τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτη-
ρίαν

κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα,
ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,

παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ
τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,

ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανοῦς,

ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ
νεκρούς.

καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

We believe in one God the
Father Almighty,
Maker of all things visible
and invisible :

And in one Lord Jesus
Christ, the Son of God,
the only-begotten of the
Father,
that is of the substance of
the Father ;

God of God, Light of Light,
true God of true God ;

Begotten, not made,
consubstantial with the
Father ;

By whom all things were
made both which are in
heaven and on earth ;

who for the sake of us men,
and on account of our
salvation,

descended, and took flesh,
and became man,
suffered, and rose again on
the third day ;

He ascended into the
heavens,

He will come to judge the
living and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

The Anathema which was added ran as follows : ‘ But those who say that there was a time when He was not, or that He did not exist before He was begotten, or that He was made of nothing, or assert that He is of other substance or essence than the Father, or that the Son of God is created, or mutable, or susceptible of change, the Catholic

and Apostolic Church of God anathematizes.' Within three months of the break-up of the Council Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicæa were condemned by a local synod on some new charge, and the Emperor, on whose authority they had been brought to trial, sentenced them to banishment (*cf.* Philost., i. 10; Socrates, i. 9; Sozomen., i. 21). It is supposed that they had been guilty of communicating with Arius (see Robertson, 'History of Christian Church,' vol. i., p. 294, note *k*).

There were a few who were sorely disappointed in the issue of the Council. The Arians in their wiliness had doubtless thought to carry the assembly with them. But of all the disappointed ones, perhaps Eusebius of Cæsarea suffered most in this direction. His castles had been built in air, and had melted away with great rapidity. Eusebius had come to the Council relying upon the Court influence, and had promised himself a signal triumph through the adoption of the Creed which he presented to the Council. 'But instead of giving a Creed to the Christian Church, he received back his Confession in a form which at first he could not sign at all' (Gwatkin, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 35). The Council had been very painstaking and discriminating. The Confession which Eusebius had presented was, indeed, a document of stainless orthodoxy. But it secured the assent of all parties by deciding nothing, and that which was most necessary at this juncture was a decision respecting the Divinity of the Lord.

But the expression 'of one essence' troubled him. Constantine, however, explained this to be directed against materializing and unscriptural views of the Divine generation. He scrupled particularly respecting the Homooousion. This, too, was explained as not meant to imply any materializing separation. The uniqueness of the Son's generation and His distinctness from the creatures was what was intended and implied by the term. So, having satisfied his conscience that, although certain terms were for the first time inserted in the Creed, they did no more than safeguard the doctrines which he had received before, at, and since his baptism; that they added nothing to the body of truth received from the Lord and His Apostles, Eusebius signed the Creed put forth by the Council (*cf.* Gwatkin, 'Arian

Controversy,' p. 37). The Catholic faith had triumphed ; but the triumph was rather a surprise than a solid victory. We shall have to notice some of the subsequent attempts to obtain a reversal of this Council's decision. Before we do this, however, we will turn our attention briefly to the Homoousion.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HOMOOUSSION.

THE first General Council had assembled ; the doctrine of Arius respecting the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity had been discussed, declared to be heresy, and appropriately condemned. The Fathers gathered together in this Council had uttered the thunders of an Anathema. And what was it against which all this mighty force had been levelled ? What was Arianism ? And what was the gain to the Church by the introduction into the Creeds of such terms as *ὁμοούσιον* and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* ? Arianism, against which the thunders of the Nicene Anathema were uttered, ‘began its career,’ as Professor Gwatkin has remarked (p. 1), ‘partly as a theory of Christianity, partly as an Eastern reaction of philosophy against a gospel of the Son of God.’ The first disciples did not and could not experience the difficulty which must perforce come upon a later generation. They had seen the Lord ; they had heard Him speak ; their hands had handled, as St. John says, the Word of Life ; their mission was to declare what they had seen and heard. The deliberate enunciation of the Lord’s Divinity under the keen scrutiny of thoughtful heathens was by no means an easy task. The Unity of God was taught by Jews and Christians, and was also generally admitted by serious heathens, but was not the Christian doctrine respecting Jesus calculated to destroy this Unity of God ? Did not the Gospels affirm that this Jesus was a man who died upon the Cross ? Was not this He to whom the Churches paid worship as the Son of God ? ‘If He was Divine, there must be two Gods ; if not, His worship was no better than the vulgar worships of the

dead' (Gwatkin, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 4). But we must remember that, although there was an apparent agreement between heathens on the one hand, and Jews and Christians on the other, respecting the doctrine of the Unity of God, this agreement was more apparent than real. In point of fact, underneath and at bottom there was no real harmony.

The Jew had the records of a marvellous history on which he based his faith. The Christian had this, and in addition had also the historic record of a God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to become the world's Redeemer, and who had come in human flesh. God was not then simply an abstraction or an infinity; not simply an Idea, as the heathens for the most part made Him; not simply enveloped in Olympian clouds, or banished from His world just because He was so great, but a living personal God, taking interest in the affairs of His creatures upon the earth. Had Christianity only claimed for Jesus Christ the place and honour of a hero, or a prophet, an angel or a demigod, in fact anything except the Son of God in human form, it would have been acceded. But Christianity claimed for Him a Divinity equal to the Father and Holy Spirit, and thus to many thoughtful minds created a great scandal. The heathens brought the charge of Polytheism against the Christians; and the aim of Arius was to defend the worship of the Christians from this charge. But in attempting to do this he committed a fatal error. He made the Lord's Manhood his primary fact. As Professor Gwatkin says ('Arian Controversy,' p. 6): 'He [Arius] could not get over the philosophical difficulty that one who is man cannot be also God, and therefore a second God. Arianism is only the philosophy of the day put into a Christian dress. It starts from the accepted belief that the Unity of God includes not only distinctions inside the Divine nature, but also contact with the world.' Arius made, as we have said, the Lord's Manhood his primary fact, but he overthrew that by refusing the Son of Man a human soul. So that the Lord can be no true Mediator, since, according to Arius, He is neither truly God nor truly man. This, then, in brief was Arianism, to circumvent which the Fathers gathered at Nicæa incorporated into the Creed the famous Homooousion. They did

not invent the term. The word was of old-established use in the Church, having been adopted originally from the language of philosophy (Harvey, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 234). 'Ὁμοούσιος properly means of the same nature, *i.e.*, under the same general nature or species. It is applied to things which are but similar to each other, and are considered as one by an abstraction of our minds. Thus Porphyry uses it of the vital principle, or entelechia, as being the same in all animate creation. *ἔλεγε ὁμοούσιοι αἱ τῶν ζώων ψυχαὶ ἡμετέραις* (Bull, 'Def. Fid.,' bk. ii., cap. i., sec. i.). So also, Aristotle, in a quotation in Origen, speaks of the consubstantiality of all stars. *ὁμοούσια δὲ πάντα ἄστρα* (Schaff, 'Church Hist.,' vol. iii., p. 655). The Valentinian Gnostics made free use of the term, as we learn from Irenæus, in speaking of the Æonic emanations, having borrowed it, according to Bishop Bull, from the orthodox expressions of the Church (Iren., 'Adv. Hæret.,' i., cap. i.). The Manichæans called the human soul, in the sense of their emanation system, *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Θεῷ*. Agapius, in Photius, calls even the sun and moon, in a pantheistic sense, *ὁμοούσια Θεῷ* (Schaff, 'Church Hist.,' vol. iii., p. 655). 'But such a usage offends against "the great revealed principle" of the incommunicable. . . . Individuality of the Divine essence, according to which principle *ὁμοούσιος*, as used of the Son, defined Him as necessarily included in That Individuality' (*cf.* Liddon, Bampton Lectures, p. 430, note *o*; Newman, 'Arians,' pp. 203-206; Newman's note on Athanasius' 'Treatises,' i., 152, note *a*, and 35, note *t*; Library of the Fathers).

The Sabellians used the word of the Trinity, but in opposition to the distinction of persons. It is therefore certain that the word was known to the ante-Nicene Church, and was used in an orthodox sense to identify perfectly the nature of the Son with the Father. Eusebius, in his letter to the Church of Cæsarea, states expressly that it was no new term to the Christian Church. 'We knew,' he says, 'that some eminent bishops and learned writers among the ancients have used the term *ὁμοούσιος* in their theological discourses concerning the nature of the Father and the Son' (Eusebius, 'Ep. Ad. Eccl. Cæsar,' quoted in Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' bk. i., cap. viii.).

St. Athanasius declares the same thing in his Epistle to the African bishops, where he states that the word was incorporated in the Nicene Creed upon the authority of ancient bishops, *τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐπισκόπων*. And in the preceding century we find Dionysius of Alexandria appealing to older writers, in confirmation of the Catholic use of the word; the consubstantiality of the Son affirmed by the holy Fathers, *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων*. The term then was not new; 'but it had been, so to speak, disparaged and discoloured by the patronage of Valentinians and Manichæans. In the Catholic theology the word denoted full participation in the absolute self-existing individuality of God. Besides this, the word suggested the distinct personality of its immediate subject; unless it had suggested this, it would have been tautologous. In ordinary language it was applied to things which are only similar to each other, and are considered as one by an abstraction of our minds,' as has been remarked above. 'No such abstraction was possible in the contemplation of God. His *οὐσία* is Himself, peculiar to Himself, and One; and therefore to be *ὁμοούσιος* with Him is to be internal to that Uncreated Nature which is utterly and necessarily separate from all created beings. But the Valentinians used the word to denote the relation of *Æons* to the Divine Pleroma; and the Manichæans said that the soul of man was *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Θεῷ*, in a materialistic sense. When then it was taken into the service of these Emanatist doctrines, the Homooousion implied nothing higher than a generic or specific bond of unity. These uses of the word implied that *οὐσία* itself was something beyond God, and moreover, as was suggested by its Manichæan associations, something material. Paulus of Samosata availed himself of this depreciation of the word to attack its Catholic use as being really materialistic' (Liddon, Bampton Lectures, p. 430). The argument which Paul employed was this: 'If the Father and the Son were *ὁμοούσιοι*, there was some common *οὐσία* in which they partook, distinct from the Divine Persons themselves' (Newman, 'Arians,' p. 209).

The object which Firmilian and Gregory had in view was not the philological 'one of restoring the word *ὁμοούσιος* to

its real sense, but the religious duty of asserting the true relation of the Son to the Father, in language the meaning of which would be plain to their contemporaries. The Nicene Fathers, on the other hand, were able, under altered circumstances, to vindicate for the word its Catholic meaning, unaffected by any Emanatist gloss; and accordingly, in their hands it protected the very truth which at Antioch, sixty years earlier, it would have obscured. St. Athanasius tells us, "*De Synodis*," sec. 45, "that the Fathers who deposed the Samosatene took the word *Homoousin* in a corporeal sense. For Paul sophisticated by saying that if . . . Christ was consubstantial with the Father, there must necessarily be three substances; one which was prior, and two others springing from it. Therefore, with reason, to avoid that sophism of Paul, the Fathers said that Christ was not consubstantial, that is, that He was not in that relation to the Father which Paul had in his mind. On the other hand," continues St. Athanasius, "those who condemned the Arian heresy saw through the cunning of Paul, and considered that in things incorporeal, especially in God, 'consubstantial' did not mean what he had supposed; so they, knowing the Son to be begotten of the substance, . . . with reason called Him consubstantial. Paul, as a subtle and hard-headed dialectician, had contrived to impose upon the term a sense, which either made the Son an inferior being or else destroyed the Unity of God. He used the word, as St. Hilary says (*St. Hilary, 'De Syn. 86'*: '*Malè Homoousion Samosatenus confessus est, sed nunquam meliùs Ariani negaverunt*'), as mischievously as the Arians rejected the use of it; while the Fathers at Antioch set it aside from a motive as loyal to Catholic truth as was that which led to its adoption at Nicæa. Language is worth, after all, just what it means to those who use it. The opposite lines of action adopted by the Councils of Antioch and Nicæa respectively are so far from proving two distinct beliefs respecting the higher nature of Jesus Christ, that when closely examined, they exhibit an absolute identity of Creed and purpose brought face to face with two distinct sets of intellectual circumstances."

'A doctrine may be held in its integrity, and yet be presented to men of two different periods, under aspects in many

ways different. So it was with the doctrine of Christ's Divinity in the ante-Nicene as compared with the post-Nicene age of its promulgation. The faith and aim of the Church was one and unchanging. But the question whether a particular Symbol would represent her mind with practical accuracy, received an answer at Antioch which would have been an error at Nicæa. The Church looked hard at the Homoiousion at Antioch, when heresy had perverted its popular sense; and she set it aside. She examined it yet more penetratingly at Nicæa; and from then until now it has been the chosen Symbol of her unalterable faith in the literal Godhead of her Divine Head' (Liddon, Bampton Lectures, pp. 431, 432).

But was this Symbol of Nicæa an expression or embodiment of the Church's faith from the beginning, or was it a development of doctrine? The answer turns upon the meaning of development. For 'language is worth just what it means to those who use it.' What is meant, then, by doctrinal development?

'If an explanation of an already existing idea or belief, presumably giving to that belief greater precision and exactness in our own or other minds, but adding nothing to its real area, is meant, a development of doctrine must necessarily be admitted. When the life of the individual soul is vigorous and healthy, there must be a continuously increasing knowledge of Divine truth. But if a positive substantial growth of the belief itself be meant, whether through an enlargement from within, or through an accretion from without, in that sense the *ὁμοούσιον* was not a development. It was not related to the teaching of the Apostles as an oak is related to an acorn. Its real relation to their teaching was that of an exact and equivalent translation of the language of one intellectual period into the language of another. The New Testament had taught that Jesus Christ is the Lord of nature and of men, of heaven and the spiritual world; that He is the world's Legislator, its King and its Judge; that He is the Searcher of hearts, the Pardoner of sins, the Well-spring of life; that He is the Giver of true blessedness and salvation, and the Raiser of the dead; it distinctly attributed to Him omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience; eternity, absolute likeness to the Father, absolute oneness with the

Father, an equal share in the honour due to the Father, a like claim upon the trust, the faith, and the love of humanity; as being in the form of God, as containing in Himself all the fulness of the Godhead, as being God. This and much more to the same purpose had been said in the New Testament. When therefore the question was raised whether Jesus Christ was or was not "of one substance with" the Father, it became clear that of two courses one must be adopted. Either an affirmative answer must be given, or the teaching of the Apostles themselves must be explained away. As a matter of fact, the Nicene Fathers only affirmed in the philosophical language of the fourth century, what our Lord and His Apostles had taught in the popular dialects of the first.

'If, then, the Nicene Council developed, it was a development by explanation. It was a development which placed the intrinsically unchangeable dogma, committed to the guardianship of the Church, in its true relation to the new intellectual world that had grown up around Christianity in the fourth century. The Nicene divines interpreted in a new language the belief of their first fathers in the faith. They did not enlarge it, they vehemently protested that they were simply preserving and handing on what they had received. The very pith of their objection to Arianism was its novelty: it was false because it was of recent origin (*cf.* Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' bk. i., cap. vi.). They themselves were forced to say what they meant by their Creed, and they said it. Their explanation added to the sum total of authoritative ecclesiastical language, but it did not add to the number of Articles in the Christian faith: the area of the Creed was not enlarged.

'The Nicene Council did not vote a new honour to Jesus Christ, which He had not before possessed; it defined more clearly the original and unalterable basis of that supreme place which from the days of the Apostles He had held in the thought and heart, in the speculative and active life of Christendom.' The Nicene fathers maintained in the language of their day the original truth that Jesus Christ is God; 'and their Symbol was at the time of its imposition, and has been ever since, a perfect criterion of real belief in the Godhead of our Lord. It excluded the Arian sense of

the word God, and on this account it was adopted by the orthodox. How much it meant was proved by the resistance it then encountered, and by the subsequent efforts which have been made to destroy or evade it. The difference between ὁμοιούσιον and ὁμοούσιον convulsed the world for the simple reason, that in that difference lay the whole question of the real truth or falsehood of our Lord's actual Divinity. If in His essence He was only like God, He was still a distinct Being from God, and therefore either created, or (*per impossibile*) a second God.' A secondary God is of necessity a second God. But from this doctrine the Christian world recoiled with horror. The ὁμοούσιον is not the dry embodiment of an abstract truth expressed in the language of speculation, nor the mere trophy of a controversial victory; but it is at this hour the monument which records the greatest effort and the greatest defeat of its antagonist error, as the guarantee that the victorious truth maintains and will maintain an unshaken empire over the thought of Christendom—enshrined in a confession which must ever furnish to the children of faith the welcome expression of their most cherished conviction' (Liddon, Bampton Lectures, pp. 428, 429, 435).

So far as regards the Homooousion. The other central phrase around which attention centred was ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας. The Nicene Fathers, in declaring the Son to be of the essence of the Father, were careful not to define the nature of essence itself, and committed neither themselves nor their successors to any theory whatever respecting it. The essence of the Father as God is unknowable and incommunicable. It is said concerning us: 'Of His own Will begat He us,' but this is nowhere said of the Son of God. His 'Divine Sonship is no accident of will, but belongs to the Divine nature. The Father is no more God without the Son than the Son is God without the Father. If we confess Him to be of *one essence* with the Father, we declare Him the common possessor with the Father of the one essence which no creature can share, and thus ascribe to Him the highest deity in words which allow no evasion or reserve. The two phrases, however, are complementary. "*From the essence*" makes a clear distinction: "*of one*

essence" lays stress on the unity. The word had a Sabellian history, and was used by Marcellus in a Sabellian sense, so that it was justly discredited as Sabellian. Had it stood alone, the Creed would have been Sabellian; but at Nicæa it was checked by "*from the essence*"' (Gwatkin, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 31).

CHAPTER IX.

Ἐκ τῆς Οὐσίας.

ST. ATHANASIUS tells us, in his Epistle concerning the Nicene Council, that it was at first intended to have made use only of Scripture words and phrases to combat the Arian heresy. The argument which it was proposed to employ was of the following kind : That Christ was the Son of God, and not from nothing, but from God, the Word and Wisdom of God, and consequently no creature or thing made. But when they perceived that the Eusebian faction would evade all those expressions by equivocation, they conceived themselves necessitated more plainly to declare what they meant by being from God, or out of Him ; and therefore added, that the Son was out of the substance of God, thereby to distinguish Him from all created beings.' And a little later, in the same Epistle, he adds : ' The synod perceiving this (the equivocation of the Arian faction), rightly declared that the Son was Homooousios with the Father ; both to cut off the subterfuges of hereticks, and to shew Him to be different from the creatures. For after they had decreed this, they added immediately, They who say that the Son of God was from things that are not, or made, or mutable, or a creature, or of another substance or essence, all such does the holy and Catholic Church anathematize.'

Again, St. Athanasius, writing against the hypocrisy of Meletius concerning consubstantiality, says : ' He that denies the Son to be Homooousion, Consubstantial with the Father, affirming Him only to be like to Him, denies Him to be God. In like manner, he who, retaining the word Homooousion or consubstantial, interprets it notwithstanding only of similitude, or likeness in substance, affirmeth the Son to be of another (different) substance from the Father, and

therefore not God ; but like to God only. Neither doth such a one rightly understand those words, "Of the substance of the Father," he not thinking the Son to be so consubstantial, or of the essence or substance of another who begat Him. For he who affirmeth that the Son is not so of God, as a man is of a man, according to essence or substance, but that He is like Him only, as a statue is like a man, or as a man may be like to God, it is manifest that such a one, though he use the word *Homoousios*, yet he doth not really mean it. For he will not understand it according to the customary meaning thereof, for that which hath one and the same essence or substance ; this word being used by Greeks and pagans in no other sense than to signify that which hath the same nature ; as we ought to believe concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

And St. Augustine ('*Contra Maxim.*,' cap. xv.) says : 'The true Son of God is both of one substance with the Father, because He is a true Son, and He is also in all respects like to Him, because He is the Son of God.' And again, in Augustine, '*De Trinit.*,' lib. i. : 'If the Son be not a creature, then is He of the same substance with the Father ; for whatever substance is not God is creature, and whatever is not creature is God. And therefore, if the Son be not of the same substance with the Father, He must needs be a made and created substance, and not truly God.' And yet again, Augustine ('*Respons. ad Sermonem Arianorum*,' cap. xxxvi.) : 'The Arians call us *Homoousians* because, in opposition to their error, we defend the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be, in the language of the Greeks, *Homoousios*, that is, of one and the same substance ; or, to speak more clearly, essence, this being in Greek called "*ousia*," which is yet more plainly thus expressed : of one and the same nature. And yet there is none of their own sons, who thus call us *Homoousians*, who would not as willingly be disinherited, as be accounted of a different nature from his father. How great impiety, therefore, are they blinded with, who, though they acknowledge that there is only one Son of God, yet will not confess Him to be of the same nature with His Father, but different and unequal, and many ways unlike Him, as if He were not born of God, but created out of nothing by Him, Himself being a creature and so a Son, not by nature, but grace only.'

CHAPTER X.

ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ.

To pass over without comment the term *ὑπόστασις*, which played so conspicuous a part after the Nicene Council, would be a serious fault. At the risk, therefore, of being thought tedious, we will present some account of this term. This plan of treating these terms separately has been adopted in preference to interrupting the text of the history, and also with a view to having the discussion respecting them in a handy form, and at a place the student can easily mark. In the latter portion of the work a similar arrangement will be found on another subject.

It was at the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, that the agreement as to the use of the term *ὑπόστασις* was come to, and although it did not at once command universal assent, by degrees it established itself, and has since continued to be used in the sense agreed upon in A.D. 362. The term occurs in the Anathema attached to the Nicene Creed. It was also of frequent use among theological writers. For a considerable period the two terms *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* were used as equivalents—in the Nicene age there was scarcely any attempt at distinction. And in the Anathema above noted the two words are used interchangeably, according to Schaff ('Church History,' vol. iii., p. 668), but St. Basil and Bishop Bull endeavour to show a distinction. St. Athanasius himself says: 'We must not imagine three divided substances in God'—*τρεις ὑποστάσεις*—evidently using *ὑπόστασις* as synonymous with *οὐσία* (Athanasius, 'Expos. Fidei,' cap. ii.). But in course of time a distinction was introduced in the East, so that while *οὐσία* continued to denote nature (essence), *ὑπόστασις* was used in the sense

which we are accustomed to express by the term *person*, and the distinction was especially characteristic of such theologians as had come out of the Arian connection to embrace the Nicene faith. The Latins, then, learning that three hypostases were maintained by some of the Orientals, took alarm, as if the word signified three different grades of nature; while the other party insisted upon using the term Hypostasis in the new sense, considering that the use of the Greek *πρόσωπον*, which answered to the Latin *persona*, savoured of Sabellianism, as expressing rather three manifestations of one Godhead than that distinction which is asserted in the Catholic doctrine. Athanasius, during his enforced residence in the West, became acquainted with the meaning of Latin theological language, and under his guidance the Council of A.D. 362 endeavoured to settle the dispute by ascertaining and explaining that the difference as to one or three hypostases was merely verbal. Three Greek terms had been in use without due discrimination being observed, the Latin equivalents being *substantia* and *persona*. Therefore some confusion was caused, and considerable alarm was occasioned in the West, where Greek philosophical terms were but little understood. Cudworth has treated this subject elaborately, quoting largely from St. Athanasius and the Nicene Fathers. He treats first of the Platonic Trinity, and, as a Platonic Christian, argues that, as in the Platonic Trinity, there is a subordination of the three hypostases; so, too, 'there must of necessity be some dependence and subordination of the Persons of the [Christian] Trinity in their relation to one another, a priority and posteriority, not only *τάξεως*, but also *όξιώματος*, of *dignity* as well as *order*, amongst them.' Proceeding, he says that 'there are sundry places in the Scripture which do not a little favour some subordination and priority, both of order and dignity, in the persons of the Holy Trinity; of which none is more obvious than that of our Saviour Christ, "My Father is greater than I": which, to understand of His humanity only, seemeth to be less reasonable, because this was no news at all, that the eternal God, the Creator of the whole world, should be greater than a mortal man born of a woman.' And thus do divers of the orthodox Fathers, as Athanasius himself, St. Basil St. Gregory Nazianzen, and

St. Chrysostom, with several others of the Latins, interpret the same to have been spoken, not of the humanity, but of the divinity of our Saviour Christ, insomuch that Petavius himself, expounding the Athanasian Creed, writeth in this manner : ‘ The Father is, in a right Catholic manner, affirmed, by most of the ancients, to be greater than the Son ; and He is commonly said also, without reprehension, to be before Him in respect of original ’ (Petavius, ‘ De Trinit. ’). Whereupon he concludeth the true meaning of that Creed to be this : that no Person in the Trinity is greater or less than other in respect of the essence of the Godhead common to them all : ‘ Quia vera Deitas in nullo esse aut minor aut major potest ’ (Because the true Godhead can be nowhere greater or less) ; but that, notwithstanding, there may be some inequality in them, as they are *hic Deus*, and *hec persona*. It is true, indeed, that many of those ancient fathers do restrain and limit this inequality only to the relation of the Persons one to another, as the Father’s begetting, and the Son’s being begotten by the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeding from both ; they seeming to affirm that there is otherwise a perfect equality amongst them. Nevertheless, several of them do extend this difference further also, as, for example, St. Hilary, a zealous opposer of the Arians, in his ‘ De Synodis,’ says : ‘ Si quis unum dicens Deum, Christum autem Deum, ante secula Filium Dei, obsecutum Patri in creatione omnium, non confitetur, anathema sit.’ And again, ‘ Non exæquamus vel conformamus Filium Patri, sed subjectum intelligimus.’ And Athanasius himself, who is commonly accounted the very rule of orthodoxy in this point, when he doth so often resemble the Father to the ἡλῖος, or to the φῶς, and the Son to the ἀπαύγασμα (as likewise doth the Nicene Council and the Scripture itself), he seems hereby to imply some dependence of the second upon the first, and subordination to it ; especially when he declareth that the three Persons of the Trinity are not to be looked upon as three principles, nor to be resembled to three suns, but to the sun, and its splendour, and its derivative light. Athan., ‘ Contra Arian. Orat.,’ iv. : ‘ For it appears, from the similitude used by us, that we do not introduce three principles (as the Marcionists and the Manichæans did), we not comparing the Trinity to

three suns, but only to the sun and its splendour ; so that we acknowledge only one principle.' As also, where he approves of this, of Dionysius of Alexandria : ' God is an Eternal Light, which never began, and shall never cease to be ; wherefore there is also an eternal splendour also co-existent with Him, which had no beginning neither, but was always generated by Him, shining out before Him. Now all these similitudes . . . seem plainly to imply some dependence and subordination. And Dionysius doubtless intended them to that purpose, he asserting, as Photius informeth us, an inferiority of power and glory in the second, as likewise did Origen before him ; both of whose testimonies, notwithstanding, Athanasius maketh use of without any censure or reprehension of them. Wherefore, when Athanasius and the other orthodox Fathers, writing against Arius, do so frequently assert the equality of all the three Persons, this is to be understood in way of opposition to Arius only, who made the Son to be unequal to the Father, as *ἐτερούσιος*, of a different essence from Him, one being God and the other a creature ; they affirming on the contrary that He was equal to the Father, as *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same essence with Him ; that is as God and not a creature. Notwithstanding which equality, there might be some subordination in them, as *hic Deus* and *hæc persona*—this God and that person, to use the language of Petavius' (Cudworth, 'Intellectual Systems,' book i., cap. iv.).

An eminent professor has remarked that Cudworth 'takes no account of the fact that the terminology and the distinction of *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* were not at that time clearly settled.'

But Cudworth must be allowed to speak for himself, and as he proceeds in his argument he has as follows : 'But though the genuine Platonists do thus suppose the three hypostases of their Trinity to be all of them, not only God, but also one God, or *μία Θεότης*, one entire Divinity ; upon which latter account, the whole may be said also by them to have one singular or numerical essence ; yet, notwithstanding, must it be acknowledged, that they nowhere suppose each of these three Hypostases to be numerically the very same. or to have no distinct singular essences of their own ; this being, in their apprehensions, directly contradictory to their very hypothesis itself, and all one as if

they should affirm them, indeed, not to be three Hypostases, but only one. Nevertheless, the Christian Platonist would here also apologize for them after this manner; that the ancient orthodox fathers of the Christian Church were generally of no other persuasion than this, that that essence or substance of the Godhead, which all the three persons or Hypostases agree in, as each of them is God, was not one singular and individual, but only one common and universal essence or substance; that word substance being used by them as synonymous with essence, and applied to universals likewise, as it is by the Peripatetics, when they call a man, or animal in general, *substantiam secundam*, a second substance. Now this is evident from hence, because these orthodox fathers did commonly distinguish, in this controversy of the Trinity, betwixt Οὐσία and Ὑπόστασις, the essence or substance of the Godhead, and Hypostases or Persons themselves, after this manner; namely, that the Hypostasis or Person was singular and individual, but the essence or substance common and universal. Thus does Theodoret pronounce of these fathers in general (Dialogue 1, "Adv. Hæret."). According to the doctrine of the fathers, as that which is common differs from that which is proper, and the genus from the species or individuum, so doth essence or substance differ from Hypostases, that is to say, that essence or substance of the Godhead which is common to all the three Hypostases, or whereby each of them is God, was concluded by the fathers, not to be one singular or individual, but one general or universal Essence or Substance. Theodoret, notwithstanding, there acknowledging that no such distinction was observed by other Greek writers betwixt those two words οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, Essence or Substance, and Hypostasis, as that the former of them should be restrained to universals only, generical or specific essences or substances; but that this was peculiar to the Christian Fathers, in their doctrine concerning the Trinity. They in the meantime not denying but that each Hypostasis, Prosopon, or Person in the Trinity, might be said in another sense, and, in way of opposition to Sabellius, to have its own singular, individual, or existent essence also, and that there are thus, *τρῆς οὐσίαι*, three singular Essences in the Deity, as well as *τρῆς ὑποστάσεις*, three Hypostases; an

hypostasis being nothing else to them but an existent essence. However, for distinction's sake, they here thought fit thus to limit and appropriate the signification of these two words, that a singular and existent essence should not be called Essence, but Hypostasis, and by οὐσία, essence or substance, should be meant that general or universal nature of the Godhead only which is common to all those three singular Hypostases or Persons, or in which they all agree. We might here heap up many more testimonies for a further confirmation of this, as that of St. Basil, ὃν ἔχει λόγον τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὰ ἴδιον, τοῦτον ἔχει ἢ οὐσία πρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν—What common is to proper, the same is Essence or Substance (in the Trinity) to the Hypostases. But we shall content ourselves only with this full acknowledgment of Petavius: "In this one thing do the judgments and opinions of all the Greeks especially agree, that Usia (οὐσία), essence or substance, and nature, which they call Physis, φύσις (in the Trinity), is something general, common, and undetermined; but hypostasis is that which is proper, singular, and circumscribed, and which is, as it were, compounded and made up of that common essence or substance, and certain peculiar notes and properties, or individuating circumstances" (Petav., "De Trinit.," lib. iv., cap. vii., sec. 2).

'But besides this, it is further certain that not a few of those ancient fathers, who were therefore reputed orthodox, because they zealously opposed Arianism, did entertain this opinion also, that the three Hypostases, or Persons of the Trinity, had not only one general and universal Essence of the Godhead belonging to them all, they being all God; but were also three Individuals, under one and the same ultimate species, or specific essence and substance of the Godhead. Wherefore an hypostasis was accordingly thus defined by some of these fathers (viz., Anastasius and Cyril) to be an essence or substance, with its certain properties (or individuating circumstances) differing only numerically from those of the same species with it. . . . Arius maintained the Son or Word to be κτίσμα, a creature, made in time, and mutable or defectible; and for that reason, as Athanasius tells us, ἑτεροούσιον and ἄλλοτριούσιον, of a different essence or substance from the Father (that which is created being supposed to differ essentially or substantially

from that which is uncreated). Wherefore the Nicene Fathers, in way of opposition to this doctrine of Arius, determined that the Son or Word was not thus *ἐτερούσιος* nor *ἀλλοτριούσιος*, but *ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ*, co-essential or consubstantial with the Father; that is, not a creature, but God, or agreeing with the Father in that common nature or essence of the Godhead. So that this is that *οὐσία*, Essence or Substance, of the ancient fathers, which is said to be the same in all the three Hypostases of the Trinity, as they are called God; not a singular existent essence, but the common, general, or universal essence of the Godhead, or of the uncreated nature, called by St. Hilary, "*Natura una, non unitate personæ, sed generis*"—One nature, not by unity of person, but of kind. Which unity of the common or general essence of the Godhead is the same also with that equality which some of the ancient fathers so much insist upon against Arius, viz., an equality of nature; as the Son and Father are both of them alike God, that essence of the Godhead (which is common to all the three Persons) being, as all other essences, supposed to be indivisible. From which equality itself also does it appear that they acknowledged no identity of singular essence, it being absurd to say that one and the self-same thing is equal to itself. And with this equality of essence did some of these orthodox fathers themselves imply that a certain inequality of the hypostases or persons also, in their mutual relation to one another, might be consistent' (Cudworth, 'Intellectual Systems,' book i., cap. iv.).

As we have remarked above, there was no clear distinction between *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. Athanasius somewhere says, 'We men, consisting of body and soul, are all one nature (*φύσις*), but many persons (*οὐσία*).' At that time *φύσις*, *οὐσία*, and *ὑπόστασις* were often interchanged, and did not become sharply distinguished till towards the end of the Nicene age. When the present use of *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* had become fixed in the East, St. Gregory Nazianzen tells us that in the formula *μιά οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, *οὐσία* signifies *τὴν φύσιν τῆς θεϊότητος*, while *ὑποστάσεις* points to *τὰς τῶν τριῶν ιδιότητας*. He observes that with this sense the Westerns were in perfect agreement; but he deplors the poverty of their theological language (Greg. Naz.,

Oration xxi.). They had no expression really equivalent to ὑπόστασις, as contrasted with οὐσία, and they were therefore obliged to employ the Latin translation of πρόσωπον, that they might avoid the appearance of believing in three οὐσίαι.

Οὐσία, with its equivalent φύσις, to which the Latin correspondents are *substantia*, *essentia*, *natura*, and, in some connections, *res*; and the corresponding English terms, 'substance,' 'essence,' 'nature,' and 'being.' Οὐσία, or essence, denotes that which is common to Father, Son, and Spirit. It denominates the substance, or constitutional being, of the Deity, which is possessed alike, and equally, by each of the personal distinctions. The essence is in its own nature one and indivisible, and hence the statement in the Creed respecting it affirms simple unity, and warns against separation and division.

ὑπόστασις, with its equivalents τὸ ὑποκείμενον, and πρόσωπον, to which correspond the Latin *hypostasis*, *substantia*, *aspectus*, and *persona*, and the English *hypostasis* and *person*. ὑπόστασις, hypostasis, is a term that was more subtle in its meaning and use than οὐσία. It denotes, not that which is common to the Three in One, but that which is distinctive of and peculiar to them. The personal characteristic of the Hypostasis, or 'Subsistence' in the Essence, was denoted by the Greek word ἰδιότης, and if we use our English word 'individuality' somewhat loosely, it will convey the idea sought to be attached to the Person in distinction from the Essence. Again, ὑπόστασις (*cf.* Heb. i. 3), and the Latin *substantia*, strictly foundation, then essence, substance, is originally pretty much synonymous with οὐσία, *essentia*, and is, in fact, as we have already said, frequently interchanged with it, even by Athanasius, and in the Anathema at the close of the original Nicene Creed. But gradually (according to Petavius, after the Council of Alexandria in A.D. 362) a distinction established itself in the Church terminology, in which Gregory of Nyssa, particularly in his work, 'De Differentia Essentiæ et Hypostaseos,' had an important influence. 'The hypostasis is a real subsistence, a solid essential form of existence, and not a mere emanation, or energy, or manifestation, but it is intermediate between substance and attributes. It is not identical with the

substance, for there are not three substances. It is not identical with attributes, for the Three Persons each and equally possess all the Divine attributes. Hence the mind is called upon to grasp the notion of a species of existence that is totally *sui generis*, and not capable of illustration by any of the ordinary comparisons and analogies. Inasmuch as the meaning of the term Person was more difficult to reach and state than the meaning of the term Essence, more imperfection and indefiniteness appear in the terminology employed (Schaff, 'History of the Christian Church,' vol. iii., p. 675, note 2; Shedd, 'History of Christian Doctrine,' vol. i., p. 365).

Πρόσωπον, persona. This term occurs very often in the New Testament, now in the sense of person, now of face or countenance, again of form or external appearance. Etymologically (from *πρός* and *ὡψ*, the eye, face), it means strictly 'face;' then, in general, front; also mask, visor, character (of a drama); and finally, person, in the grammatical sense. In like manner the Latin word *persona* (from *per* = through, and *sonus*; sound) signifies the mask of the Roman actor, through which he made himself audible (*personuit*), then the actor himself, then any assumed or unreal character, and finally an individual, a reasonable being. Sabellianism used the word in the sense of face (or phase), or character, Tritheism in the grammatical sense (cf. Shedd, 'History of Christian Doctrine,' vol. i., p. 371). This term, it is obvious to remark, though the more common one in English, and perhaps in Protestant trinitarianism generally, is not so well adapted to express the conception intended, as the Greek *ὑπόστασις*. It has a Sabellian leaning, because it does not with sufficient plainness indicate the subsistence in the Essence. The Father, Son, and Spirit are more than mere aspects or appearances of the Essence. The Latin *persona* was the mask worn by the actor in the play, and was representative of his particular character for the particular time. Now, although those who employed these terms undoubtedly gave them as full and solid a meaning as they could, and were undoubtedly true trinitarians, yet the representation of the eternal and necessary hypostatical distinctions in the Godhead, by

terms derived from transitory scenical exhibitions, was not the best for purposes of science, even though the poverty of human language should justify their employment for popular and illustrative statements.

Newman has remarked ('The Arians,' p. 208): 'The word "person," which we venture to use in speaking of those three manifestations of Himself, which it has pleased Almighty God to give us, is in its philosophical sense too wide for our meaning. Its essential signification, as applied to ourselves, is that of an individual intelligent agent, answering to the Greek *ὑπόστασις*, or reality. On the other hand, if we restrict it to its etymological sense of *persona*, or *πρόσωπον*—i.e., character—it evidently means less than the Scripture doctrine, which we wish to ascertain by it; denoting merely certain outward expressions of the Supreme Being relatively to ourselves, which are of an accidental and variable nature. The statements of Revelation, then, lie between this internal and external view of the Divine Essence, between Tritheism, and what is popularly called Unitarianism. The word "person" is in reality only a makeshift in the absence of a more adequate term. Our idea of God is more true and deep than our terminology, and the essence and character of God far transcends our highest ideas.'

For with these finite minds and understandings of ours we can never hope to grasp the Infinite Mind. His character is so many-sided that it is only by a supreme effort that we can gain even a fragmentary conception of it. We are not surprised, therefore, when we come to reflect that God has appeared to men in differing ages and times under aspects apparently entirely differing. To the writer of 'De Mundo' (cf. cap. vi.) God was *νόμος ἰσοκλινής*, an impartial law; and to Plato (cf. 'De Legibus,' book iv.) He was *μέτρον πάντων*, the measure of all things. Again, he conceived of Him as *Ἰδέα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*, the very idea of good. To Abraham He was *ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, who would do what was right. He was *ὁ φόβος* of Isaac. To Moses He was *Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Ὡν*. Later He became to the people 'Jehovah of hosts—Sabaoth.' And as the national religious life of the Jews declined, so, too, the perception of God became dimmed; and we find the men of Isaiah's age

regarding Him as a hidden God—‘Verily, Thou art a God that hidest Thyself.’ St. Paul with marvellous perception saw Him as a God of infinite mercy, love, and justice. St. John, while he undoubtedly saw Him in some measure in these attributes, yet perceived of Him most and best as *τό βάθος τῆς αἰωνίου ἀγάπης*. And at different periods since, the Christian Church has emphasized now one and now another of the phases presented to her view of the character of God. It is the finite endeavouring to fathom the Infinite. If only, in the search after truth and the endeavour to know God, it were always remembered that at best we can only trace with clearness a few rills of truth from the fountain-head, that only in the land where there are no shadows can we hope to KNOW GOD, and to perceive with clearness all the varied ramifications of Divine truth, how much happier would our lives be! how glorious the hope that should wait for the revelation of the perfect truth!

CHAPTER XI.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

THE history of the Nicene Creed subsequent to A.D. 325 must now be briefly told. Arianism had been vanquished, but was not dead. A reaction set in, as was bound to be the case, and for a century at least the fortunes of the orthodox faith wore no rosy aspect. Some of the sons of Constantine openly gave countenance to Arianism, and became its patrons. Encouraged by patronage in such exalted quarters, the professors of that Creed grew insolent and haughty, and maintained an equal warfare with the professors of the orthodox Confession. But in the end, as we shall see, the true faith conquered, and thus saved the world from a hopeless fate.

As we have said, Arianism was not dead, and it soon gave proof of its existence. Eusebius of Nicomedia used every effort to asperse Athanasius to the Emperor, and in the result a Council was summoned to meet at Tyre. The venue was, however, changed, and the Council was held at Jerusalem in A.D. 335. Arius submitted a Confession to this Council which was accepted. Thereupon the assembled Bishops wrote a synodal letter to the Church of Alexandria urging the restoration of Arius. But this was not accomplished until the malice of his enemies had secured the banishment of Athanasius. And even when he was restored, Arius showed again and again 'the same restless and turbulent spirit as before'; and the whole Arian party endeavoured in every way possible to get some one or other of their own Confessions substituted for the Symbol of the Nicene Fathers.

Socrates tells us in his 'Hist. Eccl.,' book ii., x., that

a Council was held at Antioch in Syria in A.D. 341. Here the Arian party seem to have been in the ascendant. Socrates says that the true motive of the majority of this Council was to get rid of the Homoousion, notwithstanding that they declared that they were not of the Arian party. 'They altered the Creed,' says Socrates, 'not as condemning anything in that which was set forth at Nicæa, but in fact with a determination to subvert the doctrine of consubstantiality by means of frequent councils and the publication of various expositions of the faith, so as gradually to establish the Arian views.'

The Epistle sent out by this Council ran as follows: 'We have neither become followers of Arius, for it would be absurd to suppose that we who are Bishops should be guided by a presbyter; nor have we embraced any other faith than that which was set forth from the beginning. But being constituted examiners and judges of his sentiments, we admit their soundness, rather than adopt them from him: this you will readily perceive from what we are about to state. We have learned from the beginning to believe in one God of the Universe, the Creator and Preserver of all things both intelligent and sensible: and in one only-begotten Son of God, subsisting before all ages, and coexisting with the Father who begat Him, by whom also all things visible and invisible were made; who in the last days, according to the Father's good pleasure, descended, and assumed flesh from the Holy Virgin; and having fully accomplished His Father's will, suffered, was raised, ascended into the heavens, and sits at the right hand of the Father; and is coming to judge the living and the dead, continuing King and God for ever. We believe also in the Holy Spirit. And, if it is necessary to add this, we believe in the resurrection of the flesh and the life everlasting.'

Here was a Confession which Orthodox, Arian, and semi-Arian alike could accept. But it was too vague for either party, and, realizing this, the Council some time afterwards put forth another form—*ἐκθεσις* (exposition)—which was known as the Creed of Lucian the Martyr. 'Lucian was a presbyter of the Church of Antioch, who in his early life had been connected with Paulus of Samosata, but afterwards returned to the Orthodox communion, and distin-

guished himself by his labours on the Scriptures' (Herzog, Art. 'Lucianus'). In the last persecution of Diocletian this Lucian suffered martyrdom under Maximinus, A.D. 311. The Creed attributed to him was not made public until the Council held at Antioch, A.D. 341. The occasion of the meeting of this Council was the dedication of the splendid Church which had been founded by the Emperor Constantine. From this circumstance this Creed is sometimes called the CREED OF THE DEDICATION. Those who now put it forth—it was the *second* Creed put forth by this Council—declared that it was the genuine production of Lucian, and that they had found it in manuscript. Forty of the ninety-seven Bishops assembled at this Council were Eusebians (*cf.* Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' book ii., cap. viii.). Four Creeds in all were put forth by this Council (*cf.* Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 36), in the hope, as Sozomen ('Hist. Eccl.,' book iii., cap. v.) distinctly states, that one of them might be accepted in place of the Symbol adopted at Nicæa, and which was so obnoxious to Arians and semi-Arians. Lucian had enjoyed a reputation for sanctity, and it was no doubt hoped by those who set forth this Creed that this reputation, coupled with the fact of his martyrdom, would weigh mightily in favour of its acceptance. Although composed A.D. 311, it contained the expression *οὐσία*, and no doubt this also was ground for hope to its publishers that this Creed would be accepted.

THE CREED OF LUCIAN THE MARTYR, PUBLISHED A.D. 341.

'In conformity with evangelic and Apostolic tradition, we believe in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator and Framer of the universe. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, God the only-begotten, by whom all things were made: begotten of the Father before all ages, God of God, Whole of Whole, Only of Only, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord; the living Word, the Wisdom, the Life, the True Light, the Way of Truth, the Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Gate; immutable and inconvertible; the unalterable image of the Divinity, Substance (*οὐσίας*), Power, Counsel, and Glory of the Father; born before all Creation; who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, according as it is declared in the Gospel, "And the Word was

God," by whom all things were made, and in whom all things have subsisted; who in the last days came down from above, and was born of the Virgin according to the Scriptures; and was made Man, the Mediator between God and men, the Apostle of our Faith, and the Prince of Life, as He says, I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me. Who suffered on our behalf, rose again for us on the third day, ascended into the heavens, and is seated at the right hand of the Father; and will come again with glory and power to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Spirit, who is given to believers for their consolation, sanctification, and perfection; even as our Lord Jesus Christ commanded His disciples, saying, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"; that is to say, of the Father who is truly the Father, of the Son who is truly the Son, and of the Holy Spirit who is truly the Holy Spirit, these epithets not being simply or insignificantly applied, but accurately expressing the proper person (*Ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν*), glory, and order of each of these who are named: so that there are three in person, but one in accordance. *Ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία· τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.* Having therefore this faith in the presence of God and of Christ, we anathematize all heretical and false doctrine. And if anyone shall teach contrary to the sound and right faith of the Scriptures, affirming that there is or was a period or an age before the Son of God existed, let him be accursed. And if anyone shall say that the Son is a creature as one of the creatures, or that he is generated as of things generated (*γεννημα*), and not as the Divine Scriptures have handed down each of the forenamed statements; or if anyone shall teach or preach any other doctrine contrary to that which we have received, let him be accursed. For we truly believe and follow all things handed down to us from the sacred Scriptures by the prophets and apostles.'

Even now they were not satisfied, for Athanasius tells us in his 'De Synodis,' that Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana, next put forward an exposition, in which the phrases descriptive of the Incarnation of the Son are varied from those in the preceding form. It is said that He, *i.e.* Christ, is

God, the only-begotten Son of God, the Word, Power, and Wisdom, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, who was begotten of the Father before the worlds, perfect God of perfect God, being different in person (*ὑποστάσει*) from God the Father. And it adds, also, what implies the eternity of Christ's kingdom, that 'He is coming again with glory and power to judge the quick and dead, and will endure for ever.'

Meanwhile, Athanasius, and others of the orthodox faith, were persecuted in various ways by the enemies of the Homooousion. And Socrates tells us ('Hist. Eccl.,' ii., cap. xviii.) that 'when the Western Emperor was informed of the unjust treatment to which Paul and Athanasius had been subjected, he sympathized with their sufferings, and wrote to his brother Constantius, begging him to send three bishops to explain to him the reason of the deposition of Paul and Athanasius. In compliance with this request, Narcissus the Cilician, Theodore the Thracian, Maris of Chalcedon, and Mark the Syrian, were deputed to execute this commission; who on their arrival refused to hold any communication with Athanasius, but, suppressing the Creed which had been promulgated at Antioch (Lucian's), presented to the Emperor Constans another declaration of faith, composed by themselves, in the following terms:

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom the whole family in heaven and upon earth is named; and in His only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, begotten of the Father before all ages; God of God; Light of Light; by whom all things in the heavens and upon the earth, both visible and invisible, were made; who is the Word, Wisdom, Power, Life, and true Light: who in the last days, for our sake, was made man, and was born of the Holy Virgin; was crucified, and died, was buried, arose again from the dead on the third day, ascended into the heavens, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and shall come at the consummation of the ages, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to everyone according to his works: whose kingdom, being perpetual, shall continue to infinite ages; for he shall sit at the right hand of the Father, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come. We believe in the Holy Spirit, that is, in the Comforter, whom the Lord, according to His

promise, sent to His Apostles after His ascension into the heavens, to teach them, and bring all things to their remembrance ; by whom also the souls of those who have sincerely believed on Him shall be sanctified. But the Catholic Church accounts as aliens those who assert that the Son was made of things which are not, or of another substance, and not of God, or that there was ever a time when He did not exist.'

Having delivered this Creed to the Emperor Constans, and exhibited it to many others also, this deputation departed without attending to anything besides. The Western Emperor was not favourably impressed by this deputation and their Creed, and after three years the Arian party again assembled at Antioch, A.D. 344, and set forth another Confession of Faith, which, on account of its great length, has been called *μακρόστιχος*. It will be found at length in Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' book ii., cap. xix. It consists of the Creed presented to the Western Emperor, which was really the fourth set out by the former Council of Antioch, and to this Creed very elaborate comments are added, specially relating to the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. The closing paragraph only can be given here :

'We have been under the necessity of giving this more ample exposition of the Creed, since the publication of our former epitome ; not to gratify a vain ambition, but to clear ourselves from all strange suspicion respecting our faith which may exist among those who are ignorant of our real sentiments. And that the inhabitants of the West may both be aware of the shameless misrepresentations of the heterodox party, and also know the ecclesiastical opinion of the Eastern bishops concerning Christ, confirmed by the united testimony of the divinely-inspired Scriptures, among all those of unperverted minds.'

The party that considered it necessary to put forth so many and such elaborate Confessions of Faith must surely have felt that it was in evil plight. If success were bound to follow effort, then they who put forth this *μακρόστιχος* would succeed. But with that branch of the Church for whose especial benefit these Easterns had entered into such an elaboration of their Exposition of the Faith, all their explanations had no weight.

Professor Lumby has, on p. 60, an account of a Council held at Milan in A.D. 346; but Robertson, 'History of the Christian Church,' vol. i., p. 318; Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxxvi.; Professor Gwatkin, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 83; and Milner, 'Church History,' p. 224, all agree in placing this Council in A.D. 355.

But while the Western Church remained true to the Nicene declaration, Arianism received a large measure of support from the patronage bestowed upon it by the Emperor Constantius. Thus fostered, the heresy grew, and evidence was soon forthcoming of the necessity there had been for safeguarding the true faith by the adoption of the Homousion. For some were not content to say with the Arians, 'Jesus Christ is higher than all else save God'; but men like Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, in Pannonia, went to greater lengths, and denied that Christ was a Divine being, and taught that He was merely man. The Arians could not countenance this, and, in order to devise means for stamping out this erroneous doctrine, the Council of Sirmium assembled, A.D. 351. The assembled bishops put forth a Confession of Faith, though it was not a new one. But there were added to it several anathemas designed to guard against false opinions and doctrine respecting the relation between the Father and the Son. Socrates tells us, 'Hist. Eccl.,' ii., cap. xxx., that the Creed at this Council was set forth by Mark of Arethusa. He, moreover, tells us that an Exposition was also set forth in Latin, for transmission to the Churches of the West. The Creed was presented to Photinus, who was asked to subscribe it. He refused, and, besides, he challenged his opponents to a discussion on the matter in dispute. He, however, did not convince them, nor did the Council succeed in convincing Photinus, and, rather than submit, he went into exile for the rest of his life (Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxx.). Socrates goes on to tell us that the bishops were not themselves satisfied with the Latin Exposition which they had sent out, and did their best to secure the return of all the copies. In this endeavour they were not successful, although the Emperor commanded that all copies should be sought for, and threatened punishment to any who should be detected concealing them.

About the middle of this Latin Exposition there occurs the following: 'But since very many have been troubled about that which is termed *substantia* in Latin, and *οὐσία* in Greek; that is to say, in order to mark the sense more accurately of the same substance (*ὁμοούσιον*) or of *like* substance (*ὁμοιοῦσιον*), it is altogether desirable that none of these terms should be mentioned. Nor should they be preached on in the Church, for this reason, that nothing is recorded concerning them in the Holy Scriptures; and because those things are above the knowledge of mankind and human capacity, and that no one can explain the Son's generation, of which it is written, And who shall declare His generation? It is manifest that the Father only knows in what way He begat the Son; and, again, the Son how He was begotten by the Father, etc. Perhaps they thought to silence all controversy by such a summary pronouncement. If so, they were entirely mistaken.

When the bishops assembled at Milan, A.D. 355, the few who were present from the East opened the synod by calling upon those convened to pass a unanimous sentence of condemnation against Athanasius. Paulinus, Bishop of Treves, Dionysius of Alba, and Eusebius of Vercelli rose up and loudly exclaimed that this proposition indicated a covert plot against the principles of the Christian faith. Moreover, the Western Church had now her champion, who was, as Professor Gwatkin says, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 84, 'a match for Athanasius himself in depth of earnestness and massive strength of intellect.'

This was Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, who now for the first time looms upon the history. He was not present at Milan, but owing to his whole-hearted defence of the Nicene doctrine, he was sent into exile in Asia in the spring of A.D. 356. The exact charge on which he was exiled is not known, but his very outspoken language in a letter to the Emperor Constantius may have been the cause. He says in this letter: 'I declare to thee, Constantius, what I should have said to Nero, what I should have spoken against Decius and Maximian. Thou fightest against God, thou ragest against the Church, thou persecutest the saints, thou hatest the preachers of Christ, thou abolishest religion, thou tyrant, not in things human but in things Divine' (quoted by Pro-

fessor Lumby, p. 61). The original will be found in 'Mansi,' iii., 521).

COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM, A.D. 359. THE DATED CREED.

The bishops who were assembled at Sirmium put forth two Creeds, as we have seen, one in Greek and the other in Latin; but they appear to have been satisfied with neither. We have seen how they endeavoured to withdraw the copies from circulation, but in this they were not successful. They then composed what is known as the third Sirmian Creed, but which they kept secret until it was produced in the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359. Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxvii., gives this Exposition as follows:

'The Catholic faith was expounded at Sirmium, in the presence of our Lord Constantius, in the consulate of the most illustrious Flavius Eusebius, and Hypatius, on the twenty-second of May.

'We believe in one only and true God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Framer of all things: and in one only-begotten Son of God, begotten without passion, before all ages, before all beginning, before all conceivable time, and before all comprehensible thought: by whom the ages were framed, and all things made; who was begotten the only-begotten of the Father, only of only, God of God, like to the Father who begat Him, according to the Scriptures; whose generation no one knows, but the Father only who begat Him. We know that this His only-begotten Son came down from the heavens by his Father's appointment for the putting away of sin, was born of the Virgin Mary, conversed with His disciples, and fulfilled every dispensation according to the Father's will; was crucified and died, and descended into the lower parts (*καταχθόνια*) of the earth, and disposed matters there; at the sight of whom the door-keepers of Hades trembled. He rose again the third day, and conversed with His disciples. And when forty days were fulfilled He ascended into the heavens, and is seated at the Father's right hand; and at the last day He will come in His Father's glory, to render to everyone according to His works. We believe also in the Holy Spirit, whom the only-begotten Son of God Jesus Christ Himself promised to send to the human race as the Comforter, according to

that which is written: "I go away to My Father, and will ask Him, and He will send you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth. He shall receive of mine, and shall teach you, and bring all things to your remembrance." As for the term *οὐσία* (substance), which was used by our fathers for the sake of greater simplicity, but not being understood by the people, has caused offence on account of its not being contained in the Scriptures; it seemed desirable that it should be wholly abolished, and that in future no mention should be made of substance in reference to God, since the Divine Scriptures have nowhere spoken concerning the substance of the Father and the Son. But we say that the Son is in all things *like* the Father, as the Holy Scriptures affirm and teach.'

Before proceeding further, attention must be called to the fact that it is in this Creed that the article which now stands in the Apostles' Creed, HE DESCENDED INTO HELL, first appears.

To return. The foregoing Exposition having been read, there were divisions at once in the Council. Some rose and said, 'We come not hither because we were in want of a Creed, for we preserve inviolate that which we received from the beginning; but we are here met to repress any innovation upon it which may have been made. If, therefore, what has been recited introduces no novelties, now openly anathematize the Arian heresy, in the same manner as the ancient canon of the Church has rejected all heresies as blasphemous: for it is evident to the whole world that the impious dogma of Arius has excited the disturbances of the Church, and the troubles which exist until now.' Ursacius and Valens, together with Germinius, Auxentius, Demophilus, and Gaius, were in no mind to accept any proposition containing any anathema of Arian doctrine. The two first named, viz., Ursacius and Valens, were perhaps the two most prominent disciples of Arius in the West. They had taken part in the Council of Tyre, which was afterwards removed to Jerusalem, in A.D. 335. As bishops they were neighbours, holding the Sees of Mursa and Singidunum, the modern Belgrade. Among all the plots laid by the opponents of the Nicene declaration, these two had been well to the fore. But they were very astute, and, for the most part, were found on the side which, for the time being, happened

to be the winning side. They enjoyed, it seems, much influence with Constantius. Once they overreached themselves in their effort to harm Athanasius, and had to confess to the Bishop of Rome that the charges laid against the Patriarch of Alexandria were groundless and false. This was in A.D. 347. But circumstances had changed since then, and in the summer of A.D. 357, assembling a few bishops together at Sirmium, they put forth a manifesto, in which they declared more openly for Arianism, by saying that 'the words "essence," "of the same essence," "of like essence," ought not to be used because they are not found in Scripture, and because the Divine generation is beyond our understanding.'

Here is a new departure. The mystery of the manner in the Divine generation is made an excuse for ignoring the fact (*cf.* Gwatkin, 'Arian Controversy,' p. 89). A synod held in Gaul at once condemned the 'blasphemy'; but a Syrian synod, convened by Eudoxius of Antioch, and Acacius of Cæsarea, sent a letter of thanks to the authors of the manifesto. Next, a synod of Ancyra held in Lent of A.D. 358, under the presidency of Basil, condemned the manifesto, and Basil and Eustathius of Sebastia personally went to lay before the Court at Sirmium the decisions of the synod. Then came the Council of Ariminum, the Creed of which was dated, as we have seen above, May 22, 359. Socrates, 'Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxxvii., tells us that it had long before been the Emperor's intention to disseminate Arian doctrine throughout the churches; which he, then being anxious to accomplish so as to give it pre-eminence, pretended that the departure of the bishops (they had waited for the royal permission and answer until they were wearied) was an act of contumely, declaring they had treated him with contempt by dissolving the Council in opposition to his wishes. He, therefore, gave the partisans of Ursacius and Valens unbounded license to act as they pleased in regard to the churches, and directed that the form of Creed which had been read at Rimini (Ariminum), should be sent to the churches throughout Italy, threatening ejection to all who should not subscribe it.

The whole of the West was filled with agitation and tumult; and, although it did not break out into open war,

the danger was no less a real one, and Constantius deemed it inexpedient to further provoke the popular fury. The Arian faction quitted Italy and passed into Thrace, and there, at a city called Niké, chosen, as Socrates says ('Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxxvii.), with the view of 'deceiving the more simple by the similarity of names, and to impose upon them as the Creed promulgated at Nice in Bithynia that which they had prepared at Niké in Thrace.' The Creed set forth was the Creed of Rimini translated into Greek.

So far as regards the West. Turning briefly to the East, we find that a Council was convoked by the Emperor's edict, and was held at Seleucia in Isauria. This was held in the same year as the Council of Ariminum, *i.e.*, A.D. 359. The number of those convened amounted, according to Socrates ('Hist. Eccl.,' ii., xxxviii.), to 160. Lauricius, the commander-in-chief of the troops in Isauria, was ordered to be there, and to supply the bishops with such things as they might require. Leonas also, an officer of distinction in the Emperor's household, was present, and it was enjoined that the discussion concerning the faith should be entered into before him. Acacius openly opposed the Nicene Creed, and refused to be bound by his own defence of the Lucianic Creed against Marcellus. Acacius, through the Count Leonas, put forward a Creed of his own.

The debates virtually came to an end on the fourth day, when Acacius and his adherents left the Council. Constantius afterwards directed the Acacian party to subscribe the Creed which had only a short time before been forced on the Council of Rimini. The Council of Ariminum had been dissolved in seeming harmony; Valens had protested that the heresies were none of his; but there was still dispute among a powerful minority respecting the decisions of the Easterns at Seleucia. Both parties made their way to Constantinople.

It was late on the last night of the year 359 when the deputies from the Seleucian Council signed the decisions of the Council of Rimini by direction of the Emperor. And the orthodox party, what were they doing during all this period of violence of Arian agitation?

From his desert refuge the exiled Athanasius was watching the course of events. It was at this time (359) that he

sent forth his notable work, 'De Synodis,' of which Professor Gwatkin says : 'Athanasius rises above himself in his "De Synodis"' ('Arian Controversy,' p. 98). Socrates ('Hist. Eccl.,' book ii., cap. xxxvii.) has considerable extracts from this epistle, and ends his notice thus : 'The learned who may read through his whole epistle will perceive how powerfully he treats the subject.' Athanasius endeavours to find in men like Basil of Ancyra a belief not really differing from his own and the declaration of the Nicene Council, though expressed in a rather different way. At a Council held at Sardica, A.D. 347, the doctrines of Arius were condemned, and the Nicene Symbol maintained ; although it should be stated that the Semi-Arians separated themselves from the rest of this Council, and adopted the *μακρόστιχος* of the second Council of Antioch. In A.D. 361 the Emperor Constantius died, and was succeeded by Jovian. In A.D. 362 a Council was held at Alexandria, and one of the decisions of that Council was that the word *ὑπόστασις* should be taken as the equivalent of person. The decision of the Council of Sardica to adhere to the Nicene formula was approved at this Council, and in their Synodal Epistle the bishops declare that the Son is to be held to be *ὁμοούσιος*, and anathematize those who say that the Holy Ghost is a creature made by the Son, *Κτίσμα δι' Υἱοῦ γεγονός*.

In A.D. 363 a Council met again in Alexandria, and once more the bishops who were assembled expressed adhesion to the Nicene formula. They despatched a synodal letter to the new Emperor Jovian, in which they insisted strongly upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Professor Lumby has quoted a portion of their letter (Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 68), in which they say : 'Neither do they alienate the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, but rather they join the Holy Ghost in the glory of the Father and the Son in the one Faith of the Holy Trinity, so that there is one Godhead in the Holy Trinity.'

In the same year (363) a Council of the orthodox party was held at Antioch, at which the Nicene Symbol was again confirmed, and this decision was embodied in a synodal letter addressed by the Council to the Emperor.

On the death of Jovian, Valentinian succeeded to the purple, and associated with him in the government his

brother Valens, who, like Valentinian, had been attached to the army. Valentinian took the management of affairs in the West, while Valens governed the East. The Western Emperor respected the Nicene Creed, while his brother in the East embraced every opportunity of forwarding Arianism. Perhaps the fact that Eudoxius was Bishop of Constantinople, and baptized him, disposed Valens in favour of the party. There was a wide difference between the brothers. Valentinian, although a follower of the Nicene doctrine, never molested those who differed from him in opinion, whereas Valens, the Arian, harassed and disturbed those who were of the orthodox faith. The state of the ecclesiastical world at this time has been briefly summarized by Socrates ('Hist. Eccl.,' book iv., cap. i., A.D. 364): 'Liberius at this time presided over the Roman Church. Athanasius was bishop of the Homoiousians at Alexandria, while Lucius had been constituted George's successor by the Arians. At Antioch Euzoius was at the head of the Arians, but the Homoiousians were divided into two parties, of one of which Paul was chief, and Meletius of the other. Cyril was re-established in the church at Jerusalem. The churches at Constantinople were under the government of Eudoxius, who openly taught the dogmas of Arianism, the Homoiousians having but one small edifice in the city wherein to hold their assemblies. Those of the Macedonian heresy who had dissented from the Acacians at Seleucia then retained their churches in every city.' But the clouds which indicated the coming of another storm were gathering thick and fast. The Macedonian heresy began to assume such proportions as to cause alarm among the orthodox. Hitherto it had not been necessary to make any distinct pronouncement respecting the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. Even at Nicæa it had been deemed sufficient to state the belief in the Holy Ghost in a simple and brief sentence. The doctrine of the Church respecting His Personality and Divinity was no less clear than her doctrine concerning the Divinity of the Son. But it had not at that time been seriously called in question. Turning to the ancient Fathers, there can be no manner of doubt that the Holy Ghost had from the first been associated in their minds in equal dignity with the Father and the Son.

Irenæus, lib. i., cap. ii., speaks of the faith 'in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum.' Tertullian ('De Virg. Veland.,' i.), and, in fact, all the Fathers speak of the Holy Ghost as associated equally with the Father and the Son, in dignity, glory, and essence. So the Holy Scriptures had joined them; so the Saviour, our Lord Himself, had associated them. 'Go ye,' so ran His commission, 'and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' But Macedonius asserted Him to be a creature. And thus once again the Church found herself compelled to buckle on her armour and prepare to wage another warfare in defence of her cherished convictions. When Macedonius began to deny the Divinity of the Holy Ghost in the Trinity, Eustathius said: 'I can neither admit that the Holy Spirit is God, nor dare I affirm Him to be a creature.' Those who adopted this heresy were called sometimes Macedonians, and sometimes Pneumatomachi. While many of them asserted their entire acceptance of the Nicene Creed, they yet denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. The three particular and opposite opinions on this doctrine are stated thus: Either the Spirit is an operation, or a created substance, or God. We may add a fourth, the doubt or hesitation which of the three is true. Among those who were active in opposing this heresy, Gregory Nazianzen and Epiphanius are two prominent characters. Bishop Pearson ('Exposition of the Creed': article, The Holy Ghost) has Three Assertions, the first of which is, 'That the Holy Ghost, described to us in the Word of God, and joined with the Father and the Son in the form of baptism, is a person. We all confess that two of these, the Father and the Son, are persons; that which we now assert is only this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. If we conceive it is an operation only, then must it only be actuated and not act; and when it is not actuated, it must not be at all. If we say that it is a quality and not a substance, we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable

that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is anything operative in the world beside substantial beings, and consequently, if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness.' His second assertion is, 'That the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, person.' And for the proof of this assertion we shall, first, make use of that argument which our adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created person. But the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God which is in God, and, therefore, not a created person. This argument is raised from the words of the Apostle: "For who knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost, I find denied by none. That the same Spirit is in God appeareth by the Apostle's discourse, and is granted by the Socinians. That it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God, that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth, therefore, undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created person, inasmuch as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature, and that can neither have nor be a created nature, which by nature is in God. Wherefore, although it be replied by others, that it is not said in the text that the Spirit is in God, yet our adversaries' reason outweighs their negative observation, and it availeth little to say that it is not expressed, which must be acknowledged to be understood. The Holy Ghost, then, is a person (as I have proved), and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God (as is confessed, and only denied to be in God because it is not said so when it is implied); therefore He is no created person.' Again, 'Every created person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is He now put under the feet of the Son of Man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created person. Those who anciently believed the Spirit of God to be a created person also taught that

He was made by the Son.' Epiphanius testifies thus of the Arians: καὶ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημοῦσι, καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κεκτίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ' ('Hæres.,' lxi., sec. 52).

This express notion of the Spirit of God, that he was a person, as a ministering spirit, and created, was the acknowledged doctrine of the Arians. The Arians were mainly composed of two parties, the Anomæans, or pure Arians, and the Homoiousians, or Semi-Arians. Men like Aëtius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius, represented the former, while the latter were represented by such men as Eusebius and Macedonius. They both alike denied the Divinity and asserted the creation of the Holy Ghost (*cf.* Pearson, 'On the Creed,' article Holy Ghost, p. 451).

The third assertion of Bishop Pearson 'is that which necessarily followeth from the former two, that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if He be a person, as we have proved in the declaration of our first assertion; if He be a person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second assertion, then must He of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternal God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third assertion, that it is not proved only by the two precedent assertions, but also by the adversaries of them both. He which denies the first, that is, the Socinian, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternal and omnipotent power of God. He which denies the second, that is the Macedonian, asserts that He is a person of an intellectual nature subsisting. But whatsoever is a person subsisting of eternal and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether, therefore, we look upon the truth of our assertions, or whether we consider the happiness of their negations, the conclusion is that the Holy Ghost is God. The Semi-Arian party in the fourth century attempted to steer a middle course between calling the Son consubstantial and calling Him a creature. Their position, indeed, was untenable, but several persisted in clinging to it, and it was adopted by Macedonius, who occupied the see of Constantinople. It

was through their adoption of a more reverential language about the Son than had been used by the old Arians that what is called the Macedonian heresy showed itself. Arianism had spoken both of the Son and of the Holy Spirit as creatures. The Macedonians, rising up out of Semi-Arianism, gradually reached the Church's belief as to the uncreated majesty of the Son, even if they retained their objection to the Homooousion as a formula. But having, in their previous Semi-Arian position, refused to extend their own 'Homoiousion' to the Holy Spirit, they afterwards persisted in regarding Him as external to the one indivisible Godhead (Newman's 'Arians,' p. 226); or, as Tillemont says, 'the denial of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was at last their capital or only error' (*cf.* Leo, 'On the Incarnation,' ed. Bright, p. 214, note 129).

In the summer of A.D. 364 the Semi-Arians held a Council at Lampsacus, under the guidance of Eleusius of Cyzicus. The acts of the Council of Constantinople held four years before were read and reversed. After sitting two months, they dispersed. The sum of their labours appears to be this :

They deposed Eudoxius of Constantinople ; they adopted the term 'like according to essence,' and they re-issued the Lucianic Creed for the acceptance of the Churches. They then laid their decisions before the Emperor Valens, who did not at all approve of the sentence of deposition on Eudoxius. They were ordered to hold communion with him, and those who refused were sent into exile. Thus for the time the opponents of the Nicene formula seemed to be strongest. But the end of the struggle was, in reality, not far off. The Macedonians were admitted to communion with Liberius of Rome on professing the Nicene Creed in 368. In 371, Marcellus, one of the champions of orthodoxy at Nicæa, passed away. Two years later the great Athanasius followed him. The next year, 374, Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, published a work called 'Ancoratus.' This is of great importance, because in it is contained that version of the Nicene Creed which is known as the Constantinopolitan recension of that formula. In truth, the bishops who were gathered at the Council of Constantinople in May, 381, issued no new Creed. Professor Gwatkin very clearly proves this. He does so under four heads :

1. It is *à priori* unlikely, for the Athanasian party had all along contended, not vaguely for the Nicene *doctrine*, but for the Nicene Creed, the whole Nicene Creed, and nothing but the whole Nicene Creed. In 343 at the Council of Sardica, in 362 at Alexandria, and on every other occasion, Athanasius had refused to make any revision of the Creed of 325, and always maintained that it was in no way defective. And when in 377 Epiphanius proposed some additions to the Creed on the Incarnation clauses, Basil declined even to consider them. It is unlikely, therefore, that in 381 those who were assembled in the Council should revise it. 2. There is no *contemporary* evidence that they did revise it. No historian mentions anything of the sort, and no single document connected with the Council gives the slightest colour to the story. 3. The internal evidence points the same way. Had there been such a deliberate revision, there must have been a deliberate purpose for it. We look in vain for such a purpose. Some of the variations are quite meaningless, whilst others are serious. 4. And, besides all this, there remains the fact that this same Creed was published in the 'Ancoratus' of Epiphanius, written in 374. Yet it has been known almost ever since as the Constantinopolitan recension of the Nicene Creed. Two questions, therefore, have to be answered. First, How came the fathers who assembled at Constantinople in 381 to be credited with the adoption of this Creed? And, secondly, Seeing that it was not composed by them, whence did it originate? The answer to the first question is that at the Council of Chalcedon, held in 451, seventy years after that of Constantinople, one of the speakers attributed this spurious Nicene Creed of our Communion Service to the Council of Constantinople.

It appears that when Eutyches made his defence before the Council of Chalcedon, he set forth his faith in the words of the original Nicene Creed, only substituting the singular number. He declared that this was the faith which he had received—that it was the same in which he had been baptized, and in which he hoped to die. He added that this had received confirmation at the Council over which Cyril of Alexandria had presided (the Council of Ephesus, 431), and that he himself possessed a copy of Cyril's Creed.

Now mark the following : When Eutyches had proceeded thus far, he was interrupted by Eusebius, Bishop of Doryleum, who asserted that Eutyches had spoken falsely. He added that the definition given by Eutyches was not the correct one—‘The canon does not say so.’ And in this he was backed up by Diogenes, Bishop of Cyzicus, who declared that Eutyches had treacherously represented the synod of the holy fathers at Nicæa, ‘for the Creed received additions from the holy fathers on account of the evil designs of Apollinarius and Valentinus and Macedonius, and those like them. And there has been added to the Symbol of the holy fathers the words, ‘He came down, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.’ For this expression Eutyches has left out, as being a follower of Apollinarius. For even Apollinarius accepts the holy synod of Nicæa, though eliminating, through his natural lawlessness, the expression alluded to, and he avoids the words, ‘of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,’ lest he should acknowledge the unity with the flesh. For the expression which the holy fathers at Nicæa used—‘He was incarnate’—the holy fathers who succeeded them explained by adding ‘of the Holy Ghost, and Mary the Virgin.’

It is clear then that both Eusebius and Diogenes intended to represent that a revision of the Nicene formula had taken place. Further on, in the same Council, Aëtius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, in response to a request that the exposition of the hundred and fifty fathers might be read, gave the Constantinopolitan Creed. The title had an addition of the following : ‘The holy faith, which the hundred and fifty fathers set forth in harmony with the holy and great synod at Nicæa.’ During the fifth session the Nicene Creed is given, with the addition of the four clauses, all, of course, in their proper places : ‘Of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary’ ; ‘He sitteth at the right hand of the Father’ ; ‘Whose kingdom shall have no end’ ; and ‘The Lord and Giver of Life.’ Later, the full Constantinopolitan Creed was read by Aëtius, and the Definition of the Council which prescribed its acceptance.

At the close of the fifteenth session of the Council, and after the Western representatives had left, two more canons were added to the original twenty-seven, thus making them

to be twenty-nine. The debate respecting these additional canons was a stormy one, in which Aëtius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, was prominent; indeed, but for him and Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, such canons would never have been proposed. But in the versions of the canons of Chalcedon, now extant, the two interpolated canons are not found, which looks as if they were not allowed to stand as part of the authorized acts of the Council. The design of those who represented Constantinople at the Council was to secure for that city as much recognition and importance as possible. The first of the two canons to which reference has been made puts forward the authority of the hundred and fifty fathers, but makes no mention of the three hundred and eighteen who met at Nicæa.

The whole design of the canon is to exalt Constantinople as much as possible, and to secure for New Rome a place of importance equal to that which Old Rome enjoyed. Ecclesiastical jealousy and rivalry were doing their work effectively. To conclude, then, it is probable—we should say, very probable—that the Creed known as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which was published in 374 in the ‘*Ancoratus*’ of Epiphanius, was adopted by the Council of the One Hundred and Fifty Fathers, held at Constantinople in 381; that it was received by the churches in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but at first was not more extensively circulated. Certainly, until the determined stand was made at the Council of Chalcedon by those who came from Constantinople or from churches immediately connected with it, this interpolated and spurious Nicene Creed was far from attaining general acceptance. But against this theory must be placed the fact that the first canon of the Constantinopolitan Council is a solemn ratification of the original Nicene Creed, with a formal condemnation of all heresies, ‘and specially those of the Eunomians or Anomæans, of the Arians or Eudoxians (Homœians), of the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi; of the Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarians’ (*cf.* Lumby, pp. 83-85, and Gwatkin, ‘*Arian Controversy*,’ p. 159).

Whence then came this interpolated, spurious, and so-called Nicene Creed? We have said that it is to be found

in a work by Epiphanius as early as 374. Is it, in the form in which we find it there, to be attributed to his authorship? Probably the first to repudiate such a theory would be Epiphanius himself, were he living. We may here quote Professor Gwatkin's theory of its source and authorship. He says ('Arian Controversy,' p. 160): 'Everything seems to show that it is not a revision of the Nicene Creed at all, but of the local Creed of Jerusalem, executed by Bishop Cyril on his return from exile in 362. This is only a theory, but it has all the evidence which a theory can have: it explains the whole matter. In the first place, the meaningless changes disappear if we compare the spurious Nicene Creed with that of Jerusalem instead of the genuine Nicene. Every difference can be accounted for by reference to the known position and opinions of Cyril. Thus the old Jerusalem Creed says that the Lord "*sat* down at the right hand of the Father"; our Nicene, that He "*sitteth*." Now, this is a favourite point with Cyril in his Catecheses, that the Lord did not sit down once for all, but that He sitteth so for ever.'

Similarly other points. We also know that other local Creeds were revised about the same time and in the same way. In the next place, the occurrence of a revised Jerusalem Creed in the 'Ancoratus' is natural. Epiphanius was past middle life when he left Palestine for Cyprus in 368, and never forgot the friends he left behind at Lydda. We are also in a position to account for its ascription to the Council of Constantinople. Cyril's was a troubled life, and there are many indications that he was accused of heresy in 381, and triumphantly acquitted by the Council. In such a case his Creed would naturally be examined and approved. It was a sound confession, and in no way heretical. From this point its history is clearer. The authority of Jerusalem, combined with its own intrinsic merits to recommend it, and the incidental approval of the bishops at Constantinople, was gradually developed into the legend of their authorship. The Jerusalem Creed is subjoined:

CREED OF JERUSALEM.

I. I. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀορά-
των.

- II. 2. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστον,
 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
 τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα
 Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
3. σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
 4. σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα,
 5. ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
 6. καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ
 δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς,
 7. καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
 οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.
8. Καὶ εἰς ἓν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ λαλήσαν
 ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.
9. Καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν,
 10. Καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,
 11. καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν,
 12. καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Such was the Creed which Cyril probably presented to the hundred and fifty fathers who were assembled at Constantinople, and which was probably approved by them. Its history appears undisturbed until we come to the Council of Chalcedon in 451; and on the proceedings connected with this Council we have already dealt at length. The Council of Ephesus, held in 431, and which deposed Nestorius, did not, so far as we can learn from any of the versions of its proceedings, make any variation whatever from the text of the original Nicene Creed. But this, with the anathemas appended, is recited among the acts of the Council. Yet it has been usually considered that the anathemas were removed from the end of the Creed by this Council. From this time, 431, no Creed but the original Nicene is quoted by any writer, nor is any allusion made to any other until we come to the Council of Chalcedon, where, as we have seen, the interpolated Creed was put forth, perhaps with the object of increasing the dignity and ecclesiastical importance of New Rome.

CHAPTER XII.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE SYMBOL.

THE Constantinopolitan Creed did not at once leap into favour, even after the Council of Chalcedon. No notice is found of it in any records of synods immediately succeeding the Council of 451, and indeed, as late as 525, at a Council held at Carthage, the original Nicene Creed alone was read, the Bishop of that Church, Boniface, who presided, saying, 'Fides Nicæno concilio lecta actis indatur' (Mansi, viii.). In 536, in a Council held in Constantinople itself, we find, as we should expect, as many as half a dozen allusions to the Constantinopolitan Creed (see Mansi, viii., columns 963, 1051, 1063, 1066, 1088, 1151). In the same year a Council was held at Jerusalem, under Peter, Bishop of that Church, and in pronouncing sentence against Anthimus, Peter makes mention of the Constantinopolitan Creed (see Mansi, viii., 1170). In an Epistle (the 15th) *circa* 540, of Pope Vigilius, mention is also made of this Creed, and it appears from that time onwards to have obtained general acceptance. In 553—by a slip of the pen Professor Lumby has made it 653—what is called the Fifth General Council was held in Constantinople. The shorter Nicene Creed, and the later expansion of it, are both quoted in full, and allusion is also made to the proceedings of all the four previous General Councils (see Mansi, ix., 53, 178, 338, 339).

The Eastern Church has made only one small addition to the Creed thus received. The original Nicene Creed had in the second article the words 'God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God.' In the Constantinopolitan form the first of these clauses was omitted, no doubt, as

Professor Lumby says ('History of the Creeds,' p. 86), as being contained in the third. We are in doubt as to the exact time at which the clause 'God of God' came into the Constantinopolitan Creed. It was probably introduced by some scribe whose memory had become confused, and, since it formed no contradiction to any portion of the Creed, it was allowed to stand. But the date of its introduction we are unable to ascertain. It does not occur in the Creed edited by Dr. Routh 'as the Creed put forth by the Council of Chalcedon; nor is it to be found in the 'Expositio Fidei' of the Council of Constantinople, as edited by Pithæus; nor does it appear in the definition of the Sixth General Council held A.D. 681: nor in a copy of the Creed sent by Jeremias, patriarch of Constantinople, to Tübingen; nor in a confession of Mark, Bishop of Ephesus, the manuscript of which was in the possession of Sir Thomas Phillips in 1840, when Dr. Routh's work was published. All the Latin manuscripts of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon omit the phrase. It is found in the second form given by Epiphanius, in the translation of Hilary of Poitiers, but not in the "Prisca Canonum translatio." It is not found in the translation made by Dionysius Exiguus, nor in the Gelasian Sacramentary, but occurs in the translations collected by Isidore Mercator in the Acts of the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, which instances seem to point to the conclusion that not only do we owe the addition of the "Filioque" to Spain, but that of the "Deum de Deo" also' (Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' pp. 109, 110).

But an addition to the original form has been made in the Latin versions of the Creed, and accepted by the Western Church, which has never been admitted by the Easterns, and which has been the cause, almost entirely, of the disruption between the Churches of the East and those of the West. This is the famous 'Filioque,' or 'Et Filio,' clause. The year 589 is a memorable one in the annals of Western Christendom, for in that year Reccared, King of the Goths, summoned the third Council of Toledo, and the purpose of the Council was to give emphasis to the National renunciation of Arianism. It is in the record of the proceedings of this Council that we for the first time meet with this addition to the clause in the Creed. The Council

having assembled, the King addressed the bishops, and in the course of his address he expressed himself in the following manner: 'In equal degree must the Holy Ghost be confessed by us, and we must preach that He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is of one substance with the Father and the Son' (see Mansi, ix., 977, *et seq.*). 'Spiritus æque Sanctus Confitendus est a nobis, et prædicandus est a Patre et Filio procedere, et cum Patre et Filio unius esse substantiæ.'

He proceeded to set forth, in Latin, the Nicene Creed with the anathemas, and afterwards also the Creed of Constantinople, adding 'Et Filio.' Then followed remarks upon the Council of Chalcedon, and finally the whole was subscribed by King and Queen and then by the bishops. Twenty-three anathemas were appended to the Acts of the Council, designed against Arianism and other heresies, and it is remarkable that in the third of these anathemas the following sentence occurs: 'Quicumque Spiritum Sanctum non credit, aut non crediderit a Patre et Filio procedere, eumque non dixerit coæternum esse Patri et Filio et coæqualem, anathema sit.' There is no record of any debate or discussion respecting this insertion of words which hitherto had formed no part of any officially authorized Creed. It may be that, overjoyed at the conversion of the King and his people to the orthodox faith, the bishops were not over-strict in weighing words and the meaning of expressions; it may be, on the other hand, that they were conscious that they were in language departing from the ancient formula, while free from any intention of adding anything to the ancient Faith. And, although there is no record of any remonstrance being uttered against the introduction of this addition, the wording of the anathema seems to imply that there were to be found those who impugned the doctrine. On the whole, it seems to be probable that this doctrine having been stated by the King in his opening address, the bishops seized upon the opportunity of exhibiting their King-worship; no doubt meanwhile declaring their belief that the King had spoken under Divine inspiration; in point of fact, that it was the voice of God speaking through the man. And even so it was not the first time such adulatory declarations had been made.

Once started fairly on its way, this form of the article speedily obtained reception in all countries which had dealings with Spain in the West. At the synod of Heathfield, held A.D. 680, under Archbishop Theodore, as we learn from Bede, 'Hist. Eccl.,' iv., 17, this dogma received full and entire emphasis. His words are: 'Glorificantes Deum Patrem sine initio, et Filium ejus unigenitum ex Patre generatum ante sæcula, et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter.' Again no remonstrance is uttered against the introduction of a phrase which found no place in the ancient formulæ; and this although Theodore was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, and who might have been expected to be acquainted with Eastern theology. But the storm was brewing, and before another century had run, the effect of the introduction of 'Et Filio' had been to cause a rupture between the Greeks and Latins. This began at the Council of Gentilly, A.D. 767. Mansi, quoting from Ado of Vienna, says: 'Facta est synodus . . . est quæstio ventilata inter Græcos et Romanos de Trinitate, et utrum Spiritus Sanctus, sicut procedit a Patre, ita procedit a Filio' (Mansi, xii., 677).

In addition to this question, there arose a discussion on the worship of images. The Westerns charged the Eastern Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, with neglect in this matter, and his ambassadors retorted by reproaching the Westerns for the insertion of 'Et Filio.' Thus the storm began. It, of course, increased in violence as it proceeded. Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, addressed a letter to the Bishops and clergy of Antioch, in which he set forth a Creed in which the following sentence occurs: 'And in the Holy Ghost the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father by the Son.' The second Nicene Council was held A.D. 787, and it afterwards appeared that this doctrine of Tarasius's had been accepted and approved by the then Pope—Hadrian. On learning this, Charlemagne, who had succeeded his father Pepin, King of France, sent a letter of remonstrance to the Pope on the subject of his admission of the erroneous doctrine of Tarasius, 'who professes that the Holy Ghost proceeds not from the Father and the Son, according to the faith of the Nicene Symbol, but from the Father by the Son' (Mansi, xiii., 760).

Whence did Charlemagne obtain his copy of the Nicene Symbol? Evidently it was interpolated, and a true copy of the original could not have been in use. The Pope's reply was that Tarasius is supported in this doctrine by the teaching of the holy Fathers, *e.g.*, Athanasius, Eusebius, Hilary, and others; but he fails to point out to the Emperor that in the original Nicene Creed the procession from the Father alone is mentioned. It may be, as Professor Lumby has suggested, that the great King was so powerful that the Pope dared not correct him thus far (Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 92).

But if Charlemagne himself was ignorant of the true reading of the Nicene formula, it was not unknown to those who were in close connection with him. Paulinus of Aquileia summoned the Council of Friuli, A.D. 796, 'in the cause of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Divine Word.' The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed was there set forth in a Latin translation, with the addition of the 'Filioque,' and in a letter addressed by the bishop to the King, giving a true account of all that had taken place in the alteration of this much-discussed article, the addition is defended. Professor Lumby says: 'It is hard to believe that changes which the most influential and learned of his clergy could state with such clearness could have been unknown to the King on the occasion of his remonstrance with Pope Hadrian, and we are almost driven to the supposition that the "Filioque" clause was put forward and supported for the purpose of producing a breach between the Churches of the East and West' ('History of the Creeds,' p. 94).

The synod of Frankfort was assembled in 794. The purpose of its assembling was to condemn the Adoptionist heresy, the chief supporters of which were the Archbishop of Toledo and the Bishop of Urgella. As was to be expected, when the Confession of Faith came to be made the double procession was emphasized—'the Holy Ghost is, and proceeds from the Father and from the Son.' In a letter of Charlemagne's sent out with the decrees of this Council, the doctrine of the double procession is thrice stated. At that Council there were representatives present from Germany, Gaul, Britain, and Italy. The 'Filioque' clause then was very generally accepted by the Churches of

the West. Meanwhile, the Churches of the East, disliking this latest addition to the ancient formula, were seizing every opportunity of expressing their disapproval, while the Western Churches, having adopted it, and led by that active and restless intermeddler in ecclesiastical affairs, Charlemagne, never lost an opportunity of declaring their adhesion to it. Thus, in 809, the question being again violently agitated, there was held the famous Council of Aquis-Grani. The purpose of this Council, as Eginhard tells us (Migne, civ., 472), was 'about the procession of the Holy Ghost, which question a certain John, a monk at Jerusalem, first stirred.' In the end, the Emperor despatched an embassy to Pope Leo III. to obtain his decision upon the disputed point. The case arose thus: There was a colony of Latin monks on Mount Olivet, and having introduced the 'Filioque' clause into the Creed, they were attacked by the John above-mentioned as heretics. They sent to Rome, and also to the Emperor, respecting the matter. They said that they had heard the Creed with the 'Filioque' clause inserted sung in the Imperial chapel; that it was to be found in the rule of St. Benedict, and also in a homily of St. Gregory, both of which they received from the Emperor. They also quoted a dialogue of St. Benedict which the Pope gave them, and also the Creed of St. Athanasius, as favouring the use of the term which had given such great offence to John. It has been said, but it is very improbable, that the Pope sent them back a Creed in which he said, 'The Holy Ghost proceeds equally from the Father and the Son.' The probability is that Leo III. did nothing of the kind. Smaragdus has given us an account of the discussion that took place when this same Leo admitted to an audience the ambassadors sent from the Council of Aquis-Grani, to ascertain the Pope's opinion on the doctrine of the double procession. The account may be seen in Mansi, xiv., 18-22, or may be read in an English translation in Neale's 'Holy Eastern Church,' vol. ii., pp. 1163-1167. Leo approves the doctrine, but says this is one of the more abstruse mysteries of the faith, to the knowledge of which it is not to be expected all will be able to attain. He is firmly convinced of the impropriety of introducing the phrase either in singing or reading. He reminds them, too,

that there are other mysterious truths which no one has ever thought it wise to incorporate into the Creed, and he thinks the clause should be omitted. Had his opinion been asked before the words were inserted, he should, he says, have decided against their insertion. If difficulty arose, let them give up the custom of singing the Creed in the palace of the Emperor; it was not sung in the Holy Church in Rome. Thus the cause of contention would be removed, and peace would be restored. And he begged again 'that the Churches of Germany would say the Symbolum in the mysteries in accordance with the Roman Ritual' (Martene, '*De Ritibus*,' p. 138). Evidently, then, at this time the clause formed no part of the Roman Creed. Spain, Gaul, and Germany had all received it, and it was urged on the Pope by Charlemagne; but such love and zeal had he for the orthodox faith that he could not be prevailed upon to add to it one jot or tittle. As evidence of his firm adherence to the ancient faith, we may quote the testimony of Anastasius, who, in '*Vita Leonis*' (Migne, cxxviii. 1238), tells us that from his love and carefulness for the orthodox faith, he caused two silver shields to be made, on which were inscribed the words of the Creed—one in Greek, the other in Latin—and had them fixed up in the Church of St. Peter. Fifty years later matters had changed. Nicolas I. succeeded to the Papal Chair in A.D. 858, and continued for nine years. The Photian controversy was at its height, and among other things that happened was the preferring of a charge of heresy by Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, against Nicolas. The Pope, in sending out a letter soliciting the aid of the archbishops and bishops, said that the Greek Emperors, and also the bishops of the East, were slandering the holy Roman Church, nay, even the whole Church, which employed the Latin tongue, because they said that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. Ratramn, monk of Corbey, was selected to write a defence of the position. He opens the subject thus: 'Ye accuse us that we say the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, while ye say that He proceeds from the Father alone. Let us consider what is read in the Gospel, and draw the tenor of our answer from thence' (Ratramn, lib. i., cap. iii.). We may safely conclude that within fifty years of the death of Pope

Leo III. the whole Latin Church had accepted the addition to its Creed of the 'Filioque' clause. Finally, Eastern and Western Christendom parted asunder, and became divided into hostile camps. In the separation this addition of the 'Filioque' played a very important part; indeed, Luby ('History of the Creeds,' p. 94) says: 'We are almost driven to the supposition that the "Filioque" clause was put forward and supported for the purpose of producing a breach between the Churches of the East and West.' But there were other causes at work. Rome was no longer, as of old, mistress of the world. The Empire had become dislocated; young nations were being born, and a new spirit, with the advance of new ideas, was gradually but surely forcing its way to the front. The old aristocracy and the prestige of the noble Roman families had well-nigh departed; the East grew more conservative, or its conservatism was more clearly seen, as ideas in the West became more plastic and enlightened; and thus with division of government and consequently of interests, with the rise and rapid growth of the spirit of rivalry between the bishops of Old and New Rome, specially the aggressive spirit of the former, it was impossible but that division should take place. But the Church's faith was settled, and every addition since made has been justly regarded with great suspicion. The late Dr. Liddon, in one of his latest sermons, said: 'The great separation took place, but thank God, not until the Church's faith had been determined; for in His Providence every question had been asked and answered, and the Creeds completed before the final separation.'

CHAPTER XIII.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CREED INTO THE PUBLIC SERVICES OF THE CHURCH.

THAT a formula which held enshrined within itself the essential faith and doctrines of the Church should sooner or later become a part of the settled order of Church services is no matter for surprise. It is matter for some surprise that it was not introduced into the services earlier than it was. It appears to have been first ordered to be repeated 'in every Church assembly' by Peter Fullo, who was Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 471. And Theodorus Lector ('Hist. Eccl.,' p. 563) tells us that the Creed was first ordered to be repeated at every service in the Eastern Church by Timothy, Archbishop of Constantinople, in the reign of the Emperor Anastasius. Bingham, Browne, and some others give the date of this as A.D. 511. From the East the custom spread into the West, and at the third Council of Toledo, held A.D. 589, to which reference has already been made, it was ordered to be recited at every time of the sacrifice with a loud voice, 'before the communicating of the Body and Blood of Christ.' The Canon of this Council of Toledo, and the confirming order of King Reccarred respecting it, are of sufficient interest to be quoted here. The Canon directs that 'before the Lord's Prayer in the Liturgy, the Creed of the hundred and fifty should be recited by the people through all the Churches of Spain and Galicia, according to the form of the Oriental Churches. The King's order runs: "Ut propter roborandam gentis nostræ novellam conversionem, omnes Hispaniarum et Galliæ ecclesiæ hanc regulam servant, ut, omni sacrificii tempore, ante communicationem corporis Christi vel sanguinis, juxta orientalium

patrum morem, unanimiter clara voce sanctissimum fidei recuseant symbolum, ut primum populi quam credulitatem teneant fateantur, et sic corda fide purificata ad Christi corpus et sanguinem capiendum exhibeant”’ (Mansi, ix., 983; ‘Dictionary of Christian Antiquities,’ vol. i., p. 492). The ROMAN Church was slow to adopt the custom. It would appear almost certain that in the time of Leo III., who was Pope in A.D. 809, it was the custom for some Symbolum to be said at Rome during the time of the sacrifice; but whether it was the Roman Creed, as appears from the Gelasian Sacramentary, or the original Nicene formula, or the uninterpolated Faith of the hundred and fifty, is not certain. A few years later, as we learn from Photius (‘De Spiritus Mystagogia,’ Migne, vol. cii., p. 395), Leo IV. and his successor, Benedict III., directed the Creed to be recited in Greek. Walafrid Strabo records that ‘the Symbol of the Catholic faith is rightly repeated at the celebration of Mass after the Gospel.’ Walafrid died A.D. 849. But Rome evidently adopted the custom after she found it impossible to restrain the Churches of Gaul and Germany in their use of it. In this she showed that she had learned (to quote Mr. Haweis) ‘the secret of retaining, to her own advantage, dissent within the Church.’ But the interpolation of the ‘Filioque’ into the public service was not so soon effected. However, in the days of Benedict VIII. it also found its way into the Mass service, and has so continued to this day. The date of its introduction is given by Bingham and others as A.D. 1014. The authorities for this section on the Creed in the services of the Church are: Theodorus Lector, ‘Hist. Eccl.,’ ii., 563; Bingham, ‘Eccles. Antiq.,’ book x., cap. iv., sec. 17; Browne, ‘On the Articles,’ p. 219; Lumby, ‘History of the Creeds,’ pp. 102, 106, 107; Lord Chancellor King, ‘Critical History of the Apostles’ Creed,’ pp. 44, 45; ‘Dictionary of Christian Antiquities,’ article ‘Creed.’

TEXTUS RECEPTUS OF THE NICENO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν
 μονογενῆ,
 τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
 Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα
 οὐ ποιηθέντα,
 ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
 τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
 κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος
 ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
 σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ
 παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
 κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ
 καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον
 μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας
 οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον,
 τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ
 καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆ-
 σαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

Εἰς μίαν, ἁγίαν, καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βύπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,

Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

Ἀμήν.

CHAPTER XIV.

SYMBOLUM APOSTOLORUM.

THE Creed commonly known as the Apostles' Creed, the history of which we now proceed to investigate, is of a far less rhetorical and much more simple character than the majority of those forms cited in the previous pages. The explanation is very simple: It belongs to a different family. There are between the different members of the two families of Creeds strong points of resemblance, as we should expect, and there are also characteristic points which differentiate them from each other. The Nicene Creed, as it is called, is typical of the Creeds of the East; the so-called Apostles' Creed typifies the Creeds of the West. In the one we have the fulness of expression; in the other we have concise simplicity. But when both are reduced to the skeleton stage, so to speak, we see that their structure is practically identical. They have both—this is the explanation—they have both sprung from one common stock. It is quite clear that all orthodox Creeds, whether belonging to the East or the West, have a Trinitarian basis. In the central portion of each the same historic facts are emphasized; and, in appending the various points which are believed in in addition to belief in the three Divine Persons, they substantially agree. This striking resemblance is not a pure accident; it is owing to some direct relationship of origin. As we have said, 'They have both sprung from one common stock'; but exactly how the similarity came to be so striking it is not so easy to decide; for on this point the views of scholars vary greatly, and the history is by no means free from obscurity. There are some who, like Kattenbusch, think that the Roman Creed travelled to the

East, and, in particular, to Antioch, and became the basis of such Eastern Creeds as remain to us. Harnack, in his 'History of Dogma,' i., 157 *et seq.*, thinks that the early history of the Creed turns upon two main factors : (i.) The Roman Creed, already formulated before the middle of the second century ; (ii.) a number of so-called *Κηρύγματα*, or condensed topics of preaching, which circulated both in the East and in the West. The Western Creeds he would explain by the incorporation of these locally with the Roman Creed, and the Eastern Creeds by their gradual collection into more stereotyped formulæ on the Roman model. But there are others, *e.g.*, Zahn, who endeavour to trace back the stereotyping process to the Apostolic age. Zahn is of opinion that certain changes (such as the omission of *ἐκ γένους* or *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ*) took place at Rome, or in the province of Asia, between the years 70-130, and that certain further changes (omission of *ἐνα*, insertion of *πατέρα*), which widened the gap between the Roman and the Eastern Creeds, took place at Rome about 200-220.

In addition to the foregoing, we may point out that as early as the days of Irenæus, or even perhaps of Justin Martyr, words and phrases that afterwards became distinguishing features of Eastern or Western Creeds, begin to appear. For instance, the phrase 'One God the Father' occurs no less than ten times in Irenæus in the parts where he appears to be quoting a Creed. The same author has 'Maker of heaven and earth' seven times ; 'In glory' some four times ; and 'He suffered' perhaps five times. We shall be safe in saying that before the end, or at most by the end, of the second century, there were two distinct types of Creed in existence, each of which was destined to develop into a large family ; from each of which, in process of time, should be evolved one form which should stand for and be representative of its family. The Apostles' Creed is directly descended from the shorter forms which were at different periods and places prevalent in the West, and it is possible to determine, for the most part, very nearly the date of insertion of nearly all its clauses, although it is not always possible to assign a reason for their insertion or addition. The Apostles' Creed lacks the weight of early synodical approval which the Nicene formula can boast ;

nevertheless, it comes down to us with a degree of value attached to it which it would be difficult to ignore, even if we wished to do so. It is, at least, hoary with age, yet even now its natural force is not abated ; it comes to us as a Creed which has grown up silently and almost without observation ; resting upon the firm rock of Holy Scripture, expressed almost entirely in its very words, it is, as John Cassian ('De Incarn. Christi,' vi., 3) so splendidly says, the 'Symbolum quod Ecclesiarum omnium fidem loquitur.'

The Creed in the form in which we now have it is first found in the writings of Pirminius, A.D. 750. The famous Utrecht Psalter contains a copy, but the date of this celebrated Psalter is so uncertain, and the dispute so technical, that we do not attempt anything beyond naming it. By examining the Creeds of the Western Church, we are able to note the first appearance of each article of the Creed, but the reason for the introduction of one clause in this Church and another in that is seldom clear. The venerable name of the Symbol must not be taken to mean that it was composed by the Apostles themselves, but only that it contains Apostolic doctrine. The story that each Apostle contributed one article has of course long been discredited and disproved ; but the story had a long life. From the days of St. Ambrose down to the Reformation it was known as the Symbolum Apostolorum. Rufinus adopted the story that they had 'received by tradition from their fathers, that after the ascension of our Saviour and the effusion of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles met together and settled the rule of their future preaching (*normam future prædicationis*), and being full of the Holy Ghost, they composed the Creed, each one inserting what he thought convenient.' Rufin., 'Expos. in Symb. Apost.,' sec. 2, St. Leo Magnus, St. Jerome, and John Cassian, all have the same story (Leo, Epist. 13 ; St. Jerome, 'Adv. Error.' ; Johan, 'Hierosol.,' Epist. 61, cap. ix. ; John Cassian, 'De Incarn. Christi,' lib. v.). Pirminius also adopts the same legend. Much more to the point is the remark of Shedd ('History of Christian Doctrine,' vol. ii., p. 430) : 'It is called the Apostles' Symbol, or Confession, because Christian truth could not possibly be put into a shorter and clearer statement than this.' The first to dispute the

Apostolic authorship was Laurentius Valla, A.D. 1546. Luther remarked ('Kirchenposhille,' Th. xiv., 11) that 'it was either composed by the Apostles themselves, or else brought together from their writings or preaching by some of their best pupils.' In this connection it is interesting to note the title of the work of Pirminius in which the Creed occurs. It is: 'Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris Canonicis, Scarapsus.' The last word has caused considerable discussion. Professor Heurtley thought that it was a misreading for 'scriptus.' Professor Lumby thought that the *sense* of Fabricius, who interprets it by 'collectus,' was probably correct. '*Scara*,' he says, 'is the mediæval Latin word for a troop, and *scaro* is said to mean to enrol. It is probably a Latinized form of the German *schaar*, and hence the word in Pirminius's title may be derived in the sense of a *gathering*, or collection' (Lumby, 'Hist. of the Creeds,' p. 174, note 2). Others, as Maclear, have, *scarapsus*, *pro scarapsus*, *i.e.*, *excerptus* (Maclear, p. 23).

In treating of the Nicene Symbol, we saw that it was modelled on forms that can be traced back almost to Apostolic days. Tertullian speaks of the Creed as having 'come down from the beginning of the Gospel.' And just before him, St. Irenæus had spoken of 'the Church scattered through the whole world even to the ends of the earth, yet having received from the Apostles and their disciples the faith in one God the Father,' etc. But each of these Creeds was more Eastern than Western in its character. The main substance, in many cases the exact wording, of the Apostles' Creed is, of course, to be found as early as A.D. 180. Its birthplace was Rome. Thence as a centre it spread, being slightly modified here and there, until it embraced all the Western Churches. In truth, since the days of Archbishop Usher it has been known that the original of the Symbolum Apostolorum was really the ancient Creed of the Church of Rome. And, although the Creeds as found in the writings of St. Irenæus and Tertullian have more of those points which afterwards became distinguishing features of Eastern Creeds than the Apostles' Creed has, yet we must bear in mind that in both cases the forms were put forth for use by the Churches of the West, and it would seem probable that down to the time of Tertullian the line of demarcation had

not been distinctly drawn. The Creeds of Tertullian represent the Creed of the Church of Rome as it existed at the end of the second century, as much as they represent the Creeds of the Churches of North Africa of the same date. Tertullian resided both at Carthage and at Rome in the character of a priest, and we learn from Tertullian himself that there was great similarity existing between the Creeds of the Churches of Rome and those of North Africa. Tertull., 'De Præscript. Hæret.,' cap. xxxvi., says: 'Videamus quid (*i.e.*, ecclesia Romana) didicerit, quid docuerit. Cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesseratur. Unum Deum novit, Creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex Virgine Maria, Filium Dei Creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem.' It by no means follows that because he only instances certain articles, that the Creeds consisted only of these.

Fifty years afterwards, St. Cyprian, A.D. 250, in quoting the Creed of the Carthaginian Church, cites only the following: 'Belief in God the Father; Christ the Son; the Holy Spirit; remission of sins; eternal life; the holy Church.' The truth is that each of these writers quoted just so much of the Creed as served his purpose, and it would appear that the baptismal Creed in both Churches was very short, and contained but few articles; and that at that time many of the clauses which now stand as integral parts of the Creed were accepted and believed by Christians, but were among those mysterious truths which it was not deemed expedient to insert in the Creed. The baptismal formula in the Gospel was the basis of this as of all other Creeds, and in the case of the *Symbolum Apostolorum* it long continued to be also the main substance of the Symbol. And the baptismal Creed of the Church of Rome remains to this day a brief form.

Brevity in this matter is doubtless evidence of antiquity, and for this cause we do not hesitate to assign to a very early age those brief forms which have come down to us through the Service Books of a somewhat later date. The Western Churches employed the Creeds less as a test against heresy, than as declarations of the belief of those who sought admission into the Church by Baptism. Involved in much obscurity as the history of the Western Symbol is, it nevertheless seems to be certain that this was its chief

use. The earliest Creeds, too, were Interrogative in form. The Confession of the Ethiopian eunuch was a response to an indirect question by Philip on a direct subject of belief. That he believed in God there could be no manner of doubt, and that he believed after a right manner was equally certain; but of Jesus Christ he had never learned until the day that Philip explained to him the meaning of the prophecy, and taught him certain historical facts. Conviction followed explanation and teaching, and the eunuch unhesitatingly declared his faith in Jesus Christ. The Creed in its purely 'Declarative' form belongs of necessity to a later age, and to a later stage of the growth of Christian life; the Interrogative Creed belongs just as much to this age as to the first, and has of necessity been retained by the Church for use in the Services of Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick. From the evidence of Tertullian, we know that candidates for Baptism were interrogated on the Articles of the Creed. 'They answered somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel,' so that some expansion had already taken place in his time in the formula used at Baptism. The baptismal Creeds appear to have remained brief forms for at least several centuries in almost every Church; while the Church had as a standard of true doctrine, as a rule of faith, a more extended and fuller form to which appeal could always be made upon occasion.

Thus we know that in the days of Irenæus the Creed already contained the major portion of the articles now to be found in the *Symbolum Apostolorum*, as will be seen by the example given below. From the writings of Irenæus we learn that Belief was in one God the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, our Lord, who was made flesh of the Virgin, and in His suffering under Pontius Pilate, and in His rising from the dead; and in His ascension in the flesh, and in His coming from heaven that He may execute just judgment on all. And in the Holy Ghost; and in the Church; and that Christ shall come from heaven to raise up all flesh, and to adjudge the impious and unjust to eternal fire, and to give to the just and holy immortality and eternal glory (*cf.* St. Irenæus, 'Contra Hæres.', lib. i., cap. x., sec. 1, and lib. iii., cap. iv.). The main substance, then, of the Apostles'

Creed as we know it was in circulation in the Confessions of the Western Church as early as A.D. 180. It is true that St. Irenæus does not make mention of 'the Church' as an article of the Creed, but he begins the passage quoted above with 'For the Church, though scattered through the whole world even to the ends of the earth, yet having received from the Apostles and their disciples the faith in one God,' etc. A few years after this we have the testimony of Tertullian as to the Creed of the Church. From his works we gather that Belief was 'in one God the Creator of the world, who produced all out of nothing; and in the Word, His Son Jesus Christ, who through the Spirit and Power of God the Father descended into the Virgin Mary, was made flesh in her womb, and born of her; was fixed on the Cross under Pontius Pilate; was dead and buried; rose again the third day, was taken into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. He will come to judge the wicked to eternal fire. And in the Holy Spirit sent by Christ; and in the Church; and that Christ will after the revival of both body and soul with the restoration of the flesh, receive His holy ones into the enjoyment of eternal life and the promises of heaven.'

Tertullian's belief in the Church is deduced from that passage in his '*De Baptismo*,' cap. vi., where he says: '*Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est*' (*cf.* also Tertull., '*De Præscript. Hæret.*,' cap. xiii.; '*De Virg. Veland.*,' cap. i.; '*Adv. Prax.*,' cap. ii.). Fifty years later we have the Creed of Novatian. This represents the Creed of the Church of Rome, but not of necessity the full Creed of that Church. Reference has already been made to the circumstances which occasioned the Novatianist schism; fortunately, the orthodoxy of Novatian on points of doctrine has not been impugned. The Creed of Novatian is little more than the baptismal formula elaborated. It will be found in Novatian, '*De Trinitate*,' caps. i., ix., and xxix.:

'The Rule of Truth demands that first of all we should believe in God, the Father and Lord Almighty, that is, the most perfect Maker of all things; the same Rule of Truth

teaches us to believe after the Father, also in the Son of God Christ Jesus, our Lord God, but the Son of God. Moreover, the order of reason and the authority of faith admonishes us, when the words and Scriptures of the Lord are well considered, to believe after these things also in the Holy Ghost, promised of old to the Church, but given at the due and fitting time.'

This is rather disjointedly given, being collected out of the three chapters mentioned above. The Latin text is as follows :

'Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem. Eadem Regula veritatis docet nos credere post Patrem, etiam in Filium Dei, Christum Jesum Dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei Filium. Sed enim ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas, digestis vocibus et literis Domini ; admonet nos, post hæc credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum, olim ecclesiæ repromissum sed statutis temporum opportunitatibus redditum.'

Of the same age and date is the Creed of St. Cyprian, who wrote against Novatian. The following is collected out of Cyprian, Epist. 76, 'Ad Magnum' :

'I believe in God the Father.
In Christ the Son.
In the Holy Spirit.
In the remission of sins.
In life eternal.
Through the Holy Church.'

Here we may notice that for the first time, so far as history records, the article of 'the Holy Church' is insisted upon as part of the Creed. The passage runs thus : 'Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam catholica ecclesia teneat, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse deum Patrem ; eundem filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discrepare ; sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primum, non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, Credis remissionem peccatorum et

vitam æternam per sanctum ecclesiam? mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.'

We see, then, that a very brief form of Creed was in use, for the purposes of baptism, both at Rome and also at Carthage in the middle of the third century. In point of fact, this use of short baptismal Creeds appears to have been universally prevalent. Two hundred and fifty years later, *i.e.*, *circa* A.D. 480, we find in the works of Vigilius, Bishop of Thapsus, a baptismal Creed which even at that date remained a very brief and simple form. It will be found in Vigil., Taps., 'De Trinitate,' lib. xii.:

'Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem,
Et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus unigenitum,
Et in Spiritum Sanctum.'

See Pearson, 'On the Creed,' p. 24, note, also Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 117. And to go back a little, the Creed of St. Leo as found in 'The Tome' (St. Leonis Magni ad Flav.), written A.D. 449, is: 'Fidelium universitatis profitetur, Credere se in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem; et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine; Crucifixus, et sepultus.'

And to look back a hundred years to the Church of Jerusalem, we find that there in A.D. 348 the Creed, as delivered by St. Cyril in his lectures to the catechumens, ran thus: Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανοίας. And the Creed as found in the Sacramentary of St. Gelasius, *circa* A.D. 492, is also very brief. It is an Interrogative Creed. 'Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? Credo. Credis in Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus Unicum, Dominum nostrum natum et passum? Credo. Credis in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem? Credo.' Later still, in the middle of the sixth century, the Creed of the Church of Hermiane, not far from Thapsus, was of the same brief nature as those above cited. It was preserved in the baptismal office, as we learn from the then Bishop Facundus. He says: 'Quoniam revera si veraciter confessi sive alii pro eis cum baptizarentur professi sunt credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem et in Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus et in Spiritum Sanctum, quod

Symboli tenet auctoritas, veraciter quoque credere debuerunt' (Facund. Hermiane, 'Epist. Fid. Cathol. in Def. Trium Capitulorum'; Migne, lxxvii., 871). We have here the assurance that side by side with this brief form which was used for purposes of Baptism there existed also a fuller and more complete form, which was the acknowledged and accepted standard or rule of doctrine and teaching.

And yet, so far, this form distinctive of the Western Church had not received the stamp of synodical or Conciliar approval. It contradicted no portion of that which had been approved by the General Councils, but was in strict agreement with it. The Creed of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, was presented to the then Pope of Rome, Julius, in A.D. 341, and contained almost all that the Symbol known to us as the Apostles' Creed at present contains. Marcellus, in opposing the Arians at and after the Nicene Council, was himself charged with holding the Sabellian error. To clear himself from this charge, he betook himself to Rome, and presented the Creed which is given below to Pope Julius, as a proof of his orthodoxy. Upon this confession he was admitted by the Pope to communion in A.D. 342. We have the Creed preserved in Epiphanius, 'Hæres.,' lxxii., sec. 10. Its form is as follows:

'I believe in God Almighty. And in Christ Jesus His Son, the only begotten, our Lord. Who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary. Who under Pontius Pilate was crucified and buried. And on the third day rose from the dead. Ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. Whence He is coming to judge quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost. The Holy Church. The remission of sins. The resurrection of the flesh. Everlasting life.'

The Greek text is:

Πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν· τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου· τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντιίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν· ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν· ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκοὺς ἀνάστασιν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

We may take it that this Creed was put forth in the same language as it has been preserved to us—viz., Greek. Marcellus was a Greek. And there was a special fitness in presenting this Creed in Greek to the Roman Church, for that Church, although probably bilingual almost from its foundation, yet used Greek by preference up to the middle of the third century. The suggestion of Mr. Ffoulkes that this does not represent the Creed of the Roman Church of the date A.D. 342, but that it was in reality the Creed of the Church of Aquileia, may be disposed of by our asking: (1) Is it not likely that Marcellus, sojourning at Rome, and desiring to be admitted to communion with the Bishop of that Church, should set forth his faith in the form which was known and accepted in that same Church of Rome? And (2) Is it likely that the Bishop of Rome would admit him to communion if the Creed which Marcellus professed, spoke language which was not accepted by the Roman Church (see Ffoulkes, 'On the Athanasian Creed,' p. 173; Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 123)? Marcellus, in his own land and among his own people, set forth his faith by adopting the Nicene Symbol; at Rome he professed his faith in the words of the formula which was current in the Church which was at the head of all the Western Churches. It was, in the best sense, a case of doing at Rome as Rome does. It is far more likely that Aquileia and Ravenna copied the Roman Creed than that the Roman Creed was borrowed from them. Yet this is the theory of Mr. Ffoulkes. There be but few who have accepted it. It is now well established that it was not uncommon to use a Greek Creed before baptism in the Churches of the West, and some such forms have been preserved, the best known being the one preserved in the psalter of King Athelstan in the British Museum. This was first published by Archbishop Usher. It is written in Anglo-Saxon letters, and a facsimile of it is published in the late Dr. Heurtley's 'Harmonia Symbolica,' facing p. 80.

From Marcellus, our next step is to Rufinus, who was a presbyter of the Church of Aquileia, *circa* A.D. 390. Rufinus wrote what has been entitled a 'Commentary on the Creed,' which contains a brief explanation of the Creed, and deals in some measure with its history. He is a most

important witness ; for not only do we learn what was the Creed of his own Church of Aquileia, but he also notes in the course of his exposition in several instances the discrepancies existing between the Creed of Aquileia and the Creed of Rome. We are thus able to determine almost incontrovertibly the text of the Creed of the Roman Church, and of the Western Church generally, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. The Aquileian Creed is as follows :

‘Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, invisibilem et impassibilem ;
 Et in Jesum Christum, unicum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum ;
 Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine ;
 Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus ;
 Descendit ad inferna ;
 Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis ;
 Ascendit ad cœlos ;
 Sedet ad dexteram Patris ;
 Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos :
 Et in Spiritu Sancto ;
 Sanctam Ecclesiam ;
 Remissionem peccatorum ;
 Hujus carnis resurrectionem.’

We must note here that ‘Descendit ad inferna’ was first inserted in the Creed put forth in Ariminum, A.D. 359. The clause runs thus : ‘Was crucified and died, and descended into the lower parts of the earth, and disposed matters there ; at the sight of whom the doorkeepers of Hades trembled.’ Within thirty years it had found its way into the Aquileian, but not into the Roman Creed. Bishop Pearson (‘Exposition of the Creed,’ Art. V., note) has :

‘It is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by Irenæus, lib. i., cap. ii. ; by Origen, lib. *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* in Procœm. ; or by Tertullian, “Adv. Prax.,” cap. ii. ; “De Virg. Veland.,” cap. i. ; “De Præscript. adv. Hæret.,” cap. xiii. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles’ Creed ; not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan, nor in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia,

Sirmium, etc. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons; not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the Council of Nice (Theodoret, "Hist. Eccles.," lib. i., cap. xii.); not in that of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, delivered to Pope Julius (St. Epiphani., "Hæres.," lxxii., sec. 10): not in that of Arius and Euzoius, presented to Constantine (Socrat., "Hist. Eccles.," lib. i., cap. xxvi.); not in that of Acacius, Bishop of Cæsarea, delivered in to the synod of Seleucia (*Idem.*, lib. ii., cap. xl.); not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liberius (*Idem.*, lib. iv., cap. xii.). There is no mention of it in the Creed of St. Basil ("Tract de Fide in Asceticis"); in the Creed of Epiphanius, in "Ancorato," sec. 120; Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius, etc. It is not in the Creed expounded by St. Cyril (though some have produced that Creed to prove it); it is not in the Creed expounded by St. Augustin ("De Fide et Symbolo"); not in that "De Symbolo ad Catechumenos" attributed to St. Augustine; not in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch, delivered by Cassianus ("De Incarn.," lib. vi.); neither is it to be seen in the MS. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed, it is affirmed by Rufinus that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental Creeds: "Sciendum sane est, quod in ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientis ecclesiis habetur hic sermo" (Rufin., "In. Symb.") The article found its way eventually into the Creed of the Roman Church, although we are not able to discover the exact date at which it was introduced. It was in the Creed produced by Etherius against Elipandus in A.D. 785. It is in the 115th Sermon, "De Tempore," falsely ascribed to St. Augustine, where this particular article is said to have been contributed by St. Thomas, and it is also in that Exposition of the Creed falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom, and in the Creed attributed to St. Athanasius also. It was inserted in the Creed of the fourth Council of Toledo, held A.D. 633, and also in that of the sixteenth Council of Toledo, held A.D. 693. It is generally found as above written—"Descendit ad inferna," or "ad inferna" in the ancient

MSS.—*e.g.*, those of the Benedictine, Cottonian, and Westminster Libraries ; also in the Creed of Elipandus, and the words are so recited in the Creed delivered in the Catechism set forth by authority of Edward VI., A.D. 1553. The ancient MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College has *κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα*, and the Confession of Ariminum, which was made at Sirmium, and was really the third Sirmian Creed, *εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα*. Since that it is “*Descendit ad inferos*,” and *Κατελθόντα εἰς ᾗδου*, or “*Descendit ad infernum*,” as Venantius Fortunatus (“*Expos. in Symbol*”).’

The Creed of the ROMAN Church at this period—A.D. 390 and up to *circa* A.D. 460—appears to have been as follows :

‘Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem ;
 Et in Jesum Christum, Unicum Filium ejus, Dominum
 nostrum ;
 Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine ;
 Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus ;
 Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis ;
 Ascendit in cœlos ;
 Sedet ad dexteram Patris ;
 Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos ;
 Et in Spiritum Sanctum ;
 Sanctam Ecclesiam ;
 Remissionem peccatorum ;
 Carnis resurrectionem.’

The Creed of the African Church at the same date—A.D. 390—as gathered out of the writings of St. Augustine (‘*De Fide et Symbolo*’) and from the ‘*Sermo ad Catechumenos*,’ differs but little from the above form. We are in no way surprised to find this general agreement between the Creeds of Rome and Hippo. It will be remembered that Tertullian had observed in his day how much they were alike, and the intercourse between Italy and Africa, which began in pre-Christian times, continued to flourish when both had embraced the Christian faith. Moreover, St. Augustine, although a native of Numidia, was baptized at Milan by St. Ambrose. In A.D. 393 a Council was assembled at Hippo, and St. Augustine delivered an address to the bishops, which was really a dissertation on the Creed.

He composed his address in such a manner as to conceal the consecutive wording of the Creed as delivered to the catechumens. However, it is to be gathered from the book 'De Fide et Symbolo' in the following manner :

'Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem ;
 Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unigenitum,
 Dominum nostrum ;
 Qui natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria ;
 Sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est, et sepultus ;
 Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis ;
 Ascendit in cœlum ;
 Sedet ad dexteram Patris ;
 Inde venturus est judicaturus vivos et mortuos.
 Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum ;
 Sanctam Ecclesiam ;
 Remissionem peccatorum ;
 Carnis resurrectionem.'

The other form to be gathered out of his 'Sermo ad Catechumenos' is :

'Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem ;
 Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum
 nostrum ;
 Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Virgine Maria ;
 Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus ;
 Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis ;
 Ascendit in cœlum ;
 Sedet ad dexteram Patris ;
 Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos ;
 Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum ;
 Sanctam Ecclesiam ;
 Remissionem peccatorum ;
 Resurrectionem carnis in vitam æternam.'

The same author (St. Augustine) wrote a work on the Book of Genesis, and in the first chapter he gives the Creed as an introduction to the work. In this work we meet for the first time with the word 'Catholic' in the definition of the Church. 'It is not yet an integral part of the Creed, nor shall we find it become so for a century and a half, but its occurrence here is a good example of the process of accre-

tion, by which the Apostolic Creed has been built up. First, a clause or expression is used as an illustration or explanation; if apposite, it is soon widely adopted, and in the end inserted as a portion of the accepted language of the Symbol' (Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 154).

About fifty years after the death of Rufinus, *i.e.* circa A.D. 460, St. Nicetas became Bishop of Aquileia, and wrote a work called, 'Explanatio Symboli. B. Nicetæ Aquileiensis Episcopi habita ad Competentes.' This Creed is as follows:

'Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, et in Filium Ejus Jesum Christum. Qui natus est ex Spiritu Sancto et Virgine Maria. Sub Pontio Pilato passus est, tertia die resurrexit vivus a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam CATHOLICAM: in remissionem peccatorum, carnis tuæ resurrectionem et in vitam æternam.'

This, we may safely say, fairly represents the Creed of the Italian Churches at this time. For confirmation of this we may quote here the Creed of the Church of Ravenna, as found in the Sermons of Archbishop Petrus Chrysologus, which he delivered to the catechumens. Petrus died about A.D. 450. In Sermons 56-62 we find:

'Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem et in Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris; Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam et remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, vitam æternam.'

In the time of Petrus Chrysologus Ravenna was a very important place. In A.D. 404 the Emperor Honorius had chosen it as the capital of the Western Empire, and it continued to be so accounted for the next three hundred years (see Gibbon, 'Decline and Fall,' iii. 72). We are not sure that the word 'Catholic' formed part of the Creed in the Church of Ravenna at this date. It was used certainly in Expositions and the like; and there can be no doubt that it was finding its way into the Creeds of the Church at this time. We have, early in this work, referred to words

of Petrus where he earnestly charged his hearers not to write down the words of the Creed. Another Italian Creed is to be found in the works of Maximus, who was Bishop of Turin *circa* A.D. 450. It is as follows :

‘Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentum. Et in Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus, Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam, Remissionem peccatorum, Carnis resurrectionem.’

It will be observed that the article ‘In vitam æternam’ occurs neither in this nor in the Creed of Aquileia as given by Rufinus. In this case a comment is added which shows that at that time the article had not been inserted in the Creed of Turin (Maximus Taurinensis, Homily 83, ‘Carnis resurrectionem’ ‘Hic religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est’).

The phrase ‘the Catholic Church’ appears to have been first employed by Ignatius, ‘Ep. ad Smyrnæos,’ viii. He says : ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Little need be said about the pseudo-Augustinian writings. Such a great man, and so voluminous a writer, was bound to be imitated, and there were sure to be those who would try to palm off inferior compositions as the productions of the great literary genius. In some of the sermons falsely ascribed to the great doctor of Hippo there are recitations of forms of Creeds, but they vary so little from what appears to be the settled form at this time that they only call for slight mention. We may remark that in three of these pseudo-Augustinian Sermons, which probably belong to the latter half of the fifth century, the word ‘God’ before ‘Father’ is added in the sixth article, making it read, ‘Sitteth at the right hand of God the Father.’ This, says Professor Lumby, is ‘the first step towards the fuller addition, which brought that article to its present form, and this Creed (in these sermons) is the first in which any part of that addition is found (“History of the Creeds,” p. 165). The article on the Descent into Hell is in the sermon generally known as the hundred and eighty-first, “De

Tempore," very much expanded. The Creed contained in it is of a very late form, and need not be quoted here. There are besides, six other sermons on the Creed among the pseudo-Augustinian works. The first three are evidently one discourse broken up into parts.' The other three contain the Creed in full, and the last one has, as the Creed of Aquileia given by Rufinus has, 'hujus carnis resurrectionem' in the eleventh article (*cf.* Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 167).

We have already quoted the short Creed of the Church of Hermiane, and we may now mention that there existed side by side with that short Creed a longer form, but the whole of that longer form has not been preserved to us. It has two peculiarities. In both the first and second articles it has the word 'one,' just as we have seen that the Eastern Creeds had, and, like them, it too began with the plural number. It is as follows (Facundus Hermaniensis, 'Ep. Fid. Cathol. in defens. Trium Capitulorum'; Migne, lxxviii. 870):

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty,
And in one Lord Jesus Christ His Son,
Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary;
Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried;
The third day He rose from the dead.
He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand
of the Father,

Whence He will come to judge the quick and the dead.'
Here the recitation ends with *et reliqua*.

The next enlargements that we find in the Creed are contained in two sermons usually ascribed to Eusebius Gallus. The date is matter of dispute, and the authorship also. They have been ascribed (by Oudin) to Faustus Rhegiensis, who died *circa* A.D. 500. Professor Lumby assigns them to about A.D. 550, and leaves the question of authorship untouched. 'The Communion of Saints' has found its way into the ninth article, and the word 'Catholic' has established itself in the former clause of the same article. Assuming Professor Lumby's date to be correct, it is about a hundred years since we saw the introduction of this word 'Catholic,' so as to be certain of its being intended to form part of the Creed. It was in the Creed of

St. Nicetas, whose date is A.D. 460. But if this—shall we say Eusebian?—Creed has additions showing that the process of expansion was still going on, we must notice also that it has an omission of the words ‘under Pontius Pilate.’ It also omits the word ‘only’ in the second article (*cf.* Lumby, ‘History of the Creeds,’ p. 171, and Heurtley, ‘Harmon. Symbol,’ p. 59). The next author to be quoted is one who has enjoyed a great reputation as a Commentator on the Creeds. This is Venantius Fortunatus, who was long considered the author of a Commentary on the Athanasian Creed. He appears to have abridged the work of Rufinus on the *Symbolum Apostolorum*. From this work of Venantius’s we gather the following form of Creed :

‘Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem et in Jesum Christum unicum Filium, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine : crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit ad infernum ; tertia die resurrexit, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris ; judicaturus vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritu Sancto, Sanctam Ecclesiam ; Remissionem peccatorum ; Carnis resurrectionem.’

Venantius’s date is A.D. 570. From a Gallic Sacramentary quoted by Mabillon, ‘*Museum Italicum*,’ tom. i., part ii., p. 312, the date of which is probably about A.D. 650, we learn that the exact form of the Symbol had not at that time become definitely settled, but it contains the *last* addition to the Creed as we now have it. In the first article it adds the words ‘Maker of heaven and earth.’ These words had, from very early days, found a place in all the Eastern forms, but they appear not to have established themselves in the Western forms until about the middle of the seventh century. The second article differs somewhat from our present article by reading, ‘I believe in Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Eternal Son.’ It contains the Descent into hell, as did also the Creed of Aquileia which we obtain from Rufinus, and also that Creed of Venantius Fortunatus which was most likely derived from the Aquileian form. From this time the clause always appears as an integral part of the fifth article. It had therefore thoroughly established itself. This *Symbolum Apostolorum* has now reached its full development. Every article which is contained in the form which we use has at this date, *circa* A.D. 650, been in-

corporated into the Creed. But it would be a mistake to suppose that always, and everywhere, and by all, precisely the same form of words was from this date regularly employed. We are told that even down to the fifteenth century variations of the language, more especially in the last four articles, are to be found. It appears to us that the old writers, including St. Jerome, who could not be accused of ignorance of the Latin tongue, used *ad inferna* and *ad inferos* interchangeably and as equivalents (see Note from Bishop Pearson above, p. 121). Professor Lumby's guess that it may have been due to some development of doctrine appears to us to be without much support. He himself says, p. 177, that 'descendit ad inferna' became in many instances 'descendit ad inferos.'

In manuscripts of the eighth and ninth centuries variations and omissions are to be discovered. 'The Communion of Saints,' 'The Descent into hell,' 'Maker of heaven and earth,' and 'In Vitam Æternam' are the principal omissions. In the *Rituale* of the Church of Durham, *RITUALE ECCLESIAE DUNELMENSIS*, which the Surtees Society have published, date *circa* A.D. 1000, the Creed is twice introduced, pp. 166-181, but only the first and last sentences are given. In both cases the final clause is 'In vitam æternam.' Similar instances occur in various forms, particulars of which may be seen in Heurtley's 'Harmonia Symbolica,' pp. 93-99. But about the middle of the eighth century, *i.e.*, *circa* A.D. 750, in the work of Pirminius which has been already mentioned the Creed, commonly called 'The Apostles' Creed,' occurs in the exact form in which we have it. According to Pirminius, it is the Creed as used in his day in the baptismal office. The title of the work of Pirminius is: 'Libellus Pirminii de singulis libri Canonicis, Scarapsus.' The text of the Creed is: 'Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem Creatorem cœli et terræ; et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine, passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus mortuus et sepultus; descendit ad inferna, Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit ad cœlos, Sedit ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; Sanctam Ecclesiam Catho-

licam ; Sanctorum Communionem ; 'Remissionem peccatorum ; Carnis resurrectionem ; Vitam æternam.' Pirminius adopts the story, evidently believing it, that this Creed was composed by the Apostles themselves. The Creed thus preserved became eventually the accepted version, and has remained so ever since. Though it has grown, so to speak, in the dark, and is devoid of that Conciliar sanction which the Niceno-Constantinopolitan form enjoys, it yet has a sanction which, after all, is stronger, more powerful, and really of more value ; the consent of centuries and generations of believing souls who have used it to express the faith which was in their hearts, and the very life of their souls. Even in these degenerate days, with lack of discipline, and with all the evils which the Church has to endure, this Apostolic Symbol is a flag under which men of many shades of opinion can range themselves, and confess its truths with one heart and one voice. And, amid all the sad divisions which exist among Christians of the Anglican race and tongue, it is refreshing to call to mind from time to time, that in this Symbol of silent growth, and free from metaphysical subtleties, we have a common basis of faith, a common expression of belief, and which perhaps, after all, binds us more firmly and really together than we are at all times willing to allow. In any movement for Reunion among the various parties of Christians this venerable and venerated Symbol will not take the most insignificant place. May that day soon come when all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and accept the doctrines of the written Word of God, shall, without equivocation or reservation of any kind, be able to confess the true belief of their souls with one voice and in the same words.

Before we conclude this account of the Apostolic Symbol, it remains for us to notice its introduction into the daily services of the Church. Mr. Ffoulkes, 'On the Athanasian Creed,' p. 184, has shown that in a manuscript now at the Vatican, in which are recorded the acts of the Council of Aquis-Grani (afterwards Aix-la-Chapelle), held A.D. 816, under Charlemagne, there is a provision made for the use, in secret only, *at Prime*, of the CREDO IN DEUM. Fifty years before that date, Chrodegand, Bishop of Metz, put forth the 'Regula Canonicorum,' but in this there is

no mention of the use of the Credo. Amalarius Fortunatus, deacon of Metz, who died very soon after A.D. 840, in a treatise '*De Eccl. Officiis*,' iv. 2, says: 'After the Lord's Prayer there follows our belief which the holy apostles drew up, concerning the faith of the Holy Trinity, and the dispensation of our Lord's Incarnation, and the state of our Church.' Supposing that the Council of Aquis-Grani did order its recitation, it would appear to have become almost immediately the rule of a great part of the Western Church. The Apostles' Creed was deemed of sufficient importance to be recited against the errors of Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, Bishop of Urgella, in a Council held A.D. 785. It was recited by Etherius, Bishop of Osma, and Beatus, a presbyter, of Astorga. After speaking for some time on the matter in debate, they said: '*Sed sicut corde credemus ore proprio proferamus publice et dicamus CREDO IN DEUM*,' etc. When the Creed had been recited, Etherius added: '*Ecce fidem Apostolicam in qua baptizati sumus, quam credemus et tenemus*.' We may remind ourselves that this Council was held under the weighty influence of Charlemagne, and he who could secure the admission of the '*Filioque*' clause into the Creed, could also secure that the place which had been assigned to the Creed in the Offices of the Church at Aquis-Grani should be assigned to it in other Churches also. The Roman Church, we learn from Mabillon, '*De Liturg. Gallic.*,' i. 3, made great efforts to obtain uniformity in the matter of Service-books and Uses. Eventually, in the matter of the Psalter, the Gallican triumphed over the Roman. The Empire of Charlemagne was so extensive, and his influence so powerful, that together they did very much towards settling that universal usage of the public recitation of the Creed in the Services of the Church.

We must not omit to redeem the promise made on page 5, to give our readers some specimens of Latin encomiums upon the Creed.

St. Augustine, '*Serm. de Tempore*,' Sermon 131, calls it: 'The Illumination of the Soul, the perfection of believers, by which the bond of Infidelity is dissolved, the Gate of Life is opened, and the glory of faith is shown; little in-

deed in words, but great in mysteries ; short, so as not to oppress the memory, yet comprehensive, so as to exceed the understanding.'

And John Cassian also ('De Incarn. Christi,' lib. v.) says that 'the Creed comprehends in itself in few words the faith of both Testaments and the sense of the whole Scripture.'

And Petrus Chrysologus also says that 'it is the Entrance into Life, the Gate of Salvation, a peculiar, innocent, and pure Confession, the Covenant of Life, the Plea of Salvation, and the indissoluble Sacrament of faith between God and us' (Petrus Chrysologus in 'Symbolum Apostolorum,' Sermons 56 and 58).

And Maximus Taurinensis also says : 'This is the Symbol, by the sign of which the faithful are separated from unbelievers, whose truth makes every believer of it a Christian, sanctifies the living, and maketh the dead to live' (Maximus Taurinensis, 'Homily in Symbol').

Professor Lumby has devoted several pages to a discussion of the theory of Mr. Ffoulkes, and to the refutation of that theory, and seems to have proved conclusively that the work which goes by the name of Rufinus is his in reality. It has not been deemed of sufficient interest to go into thoroughly in these pages, but the reader who may wish to pursue the subject will find the discussion in Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' pp. 127 *et seq.*

BAPTISMAL CREED AS USED IN THE ROMAN CHURCH AT THE PRESENT TIME.

Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ ?—Credo.

Credis et in Jesum Christum, filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum natum et passum ?—Credo.

Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam : Remissionem peccatorum : Carnis resurrectionem : Vitam Æternam ?—Credo.

CHAPTER XV.

THE 'QUICUNQUE'—WHO WAS ITS AUTHOR?

Upon these Feasts : Christmas Day, the Epiphany, St. Matthias, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Whit Sunday, St. John Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, St. Andrew, and upon Trinity Sunday, shall be sung or said at Morning Prayer, instead of the Apostles' Creed, this Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, by the minister and people standing.—*At Morning Prayer.*

IN the preceding chapters of this work we have endeavoured to trace the histories of those venerable Symbols which stand as the safeguards of the Christian Faith, and in which are enshrined the Church's beliefs. Some passages in their histories are, as we have seen, more or less obscure to us at this distance of time ; and this obscurity may be due in part to the want of a clear perception of the duties which historians owe to posterity on the part of those who wrote the histories ; in part, possibly, to the loss of some of the records ; and in part doubtless to the fact that they were in many of their details framed amid the dust which was raised by the almost ceaseless conflicts in the arena of theological controversy. The conflicts between theologians respecting these ancient Symbols have long since ceased, and for ages they have been awarded by common consent the place of honour in the Church's system. The theological battles concerning these had, except for one clause, practically ceased by the middle of the eighth century, and thenceforward, except in the case of the 'Filioque' clause as regards both the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, there was peace. But the case of the 'Quicunque' is different. At the time when, with the exception just mentioned, the

sounds of battle were all but silenced as regards the older Symbols, the war of controversy had not yet begun to rage around the 'Quicunque,' even if that composition was itself in existence. It was destined, however, to play a conspicuous part in the Church history of the after-ages, and for the past hundred and eighty years it has been a favourite battle-ground for theological combatants; and even yet the war of controversy rages around it, although some of its fierceness has abated.

That controversy still rages around the 'Quicunque' not only with respect to its authorship and date, but more particularly respecting some of its clauses, and its use in the public services of the Church is clear from a correspondence between Dr. Perowne, Bishop of Worcester, and Lord Halifax, which was published in the *Times* of August 17, 1898. At a meeting of the English Church Union, held on the previous 16th of June, Lord Halifax said that those who advocate the removal of the Athanasian Creed from the public services of the Church do so 'because it insists on the necessity of holding the Catholic Faith.' This statement was warmly controverted by the Bishop of Worcester, who said in the course of his reply: 'That is not the ground on which the opposition to the public recitation of the Creed is based. I have never heard anyone take that ground.' The Bishop then goes on to make an interesting quotation from Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who objected to the Condemnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. The quotation is from 'Liberty of Prophesying,' sec. II., 36, and is as follows: 'But, now, if I should be questioned concerning the Symbol of Athanasius, I confess I cannot see that moderate sentence and gentleness of charity in his preface and conclusion as there was in the Nicene Creed. Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly unless the Article of the Trinity be believed as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explained. . . . For the Articles themselves, I am most heartily persuaded of the truth of them, and yet I dare not say all that are not so are irrevocably damned; because *citra hoc symbolum* the faith of the Apostles' Creed is entire; and "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," that is, he that believeth with such a belief as is sufficient disposition to be baptized, that

faith with the Sacrament is sufficient for heaven. Now, the Apostles' Creed does one; why, therefore, do not both entitle us to the promise? Besides, if it were considered concerning Athanasius' Creed how many people understand it not, how contrary to natural reason it seems, how little the Scripture says of those curiosities of explication, and how tradition was not clear on his side for the article itself, much less for those forms and minutes . . . and, after all this, that the Nicene Creed itself went not so far neither in article nor anathema nor explication, it had not been amiss if the final judgment had been left to Jesus Christ, for He is appointed Judge of all the world, and He shall judge the people righteously.'

The Bishop of Worcester proceeds to point out that Bishop Jeremy Taylor declared that he was most heartily persuaded of the truth of the articles of the 'Quicunque vult,' and yet objected to it because of its anathemas and its curiosities of explication. The Bishop then adds: 'And those of us who object to the recitation of the Creed in the public services of the Church do so mainly on the same ground. We do so because the unknown author has not only taken upon himself to declare dogmatically what the Catholic faith is, but has attached the pain of eternal damnation to those who do not accept his "curiosities of explication" as though it were the very word of Scripture itself. Scripture has said, "he that believeth not shall be damned," but it has nowhere said, he that believeth not the Articles of the Christian Faith as set forth in the "Quicunque vult" shall be damned. But, besides this, we object to this public recitation because it is unknown to the rest of Christendom. There is not a single Church but our own, east or west, which has this recitation. Then it is not "Catholic"; and I find it very difficult to understand how it is that your lordship, who attaches so much value to Catholic tradition, should plead so earnestly on behalf of an observance which most assuredly is not "Catholic."'

The reply of Lord Halifax was to the effect that his lordship had thought that it was outside controversy that the real objection to the use of the Athanasian Creed was to be found in certain opinions held by some people, 'who never appeared to consider a right faith a matter of any con-

sequence.' His lordship added : 'Certainly the popular objections to the Creed are founded on a dislike to any sort of authority in matters of faith, and it has usually been defended as being an outwork of the dogmatic position, and on the ground of the necessity of such authority for safeguarding the witness of Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Church.'

The Bishop of Worcester, in replying to this letter, reiterated (with emphasis) the remarks made in his former letter, and says : 'It is not true, and my letter ought to have convinced you that it is not true, that the opposition to the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed arises from any dislike of the doctrines which it expounds, or because "it insists on the necessity of holding the Catholic faith." For myself, I utterly repudiate the charge. I do not think a right faith a matter of little moment. With multitudes of others who object to the recitation of the Creed, I hold the great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation as strongly as your lordship does. In my last letter I appealed to an authority which you cannot possibly set aside. I quoted some passages from Bishop Jeremy Taylor expressive of his disapproval of the damnatory clauses and the "curious explications" and "minute particularities" of the Creed. I pointed out to you that that learned and eloquent prelate at the same time declares that he is "most heartily persuaded of the truth" of the articles of the Creed. Yet of all this your lordship takes no notice. My lord, you cannot call in question the faith or sincerity of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. You will not dare to do it. Then how can you maintain that it is "outside controversy" that the objection to the public use of the Creed rests upon such grounds as your lordship has alleged? How is it that you persist in your accusation? Will you venture to say that great Bishops and learned divines like Bishop Thirlwall and Archbishop Magee, who were opposed to the public recitation of the Creed, were opposed to it because they "never appeared to consider a right faith a matter of any consequence"?'

After reminding Lord Halifax that he (the Bishop) had challenged him to name one single objector, being a Churchman or a professing Christian, who has based his objection

to the public use of the Creed on the ground that it insists on the necessity of holding the Catholic faith, and that Lord Halifax has not attempted to name so much as one, the Bishop goes on to deal with the remark that the Athanasian Creed 'has usually been defended as the outwork of the dogmatic position.' He says: 'You add, "It (the Creed) has usually been defended as being an outwork of the dogmatic position, and on the ground of the necessity of such authority for safeguarding the witness of Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Church."' Here you shift your ground, and allege reasons for defending the Creed, not the public recitation thereof. I will not enter on this ground, as it does not immediately concern me. I may say, however, that I am surprised to hear that in your eyes, and, I presume, in the eyes of your friends, the Creed is to be defended as "an outwork of the dogmatic position" (whatever that may be); *à fortiori* therefore must the recitation of the Creed be an outwork, and an outwork may sometimes be surrendered whilst the centre and citadel of the defence may remain untouched, and even be the stronger. I am almost tempted to ask what your lordship means by "Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Church."

The isolated position of the Church of England with respect to the use of this 'Quicunque' is then stated by the Bishop as follows: 'I must, however, say one word as to the second reason which I gave for objecting to the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed (or hymn) in our services—viz., that it isolates us from the rest of Christendom.

'As I said, "there is not a single Church but our own, east or west, which has this recitation. Then it is not Catholic." How does your lordship meet this objection? By saying that "if the laity abroad" (*i.e.*, be it remembered, in the Roman Church only) "had preserved the custom, happily maintained in England to a considerable extent, of attending the morning office of the Church, they would take part in the recitation, not, say, twelve or fourteen times a year, as is the case with us, but on every Sunday, and I think every feast-day in the year." Your lordship must surely have forgotten that the recitation of the Creed in the office of Prime in the Roman Church is in Latin, and that the laity, being for the most part ignorant of its contents,

could neither have profited by its teaching nor have been offended by its anathemas. If the Creed had been recited, as it is with us, in the vulgar tongue, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the laity would have kept their lips as firmly closed during the recitation as the great bulk of them do in England now.'

The gist of the reply of Lord Halifax is contained in the following brief extract: 'I will only add, after your lordship's second letter, which I have just got, that, while I entirely accept your lordship's explanation, and am sure that your dislike to the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed does not proceed from any difficulty as to the statement contained in it, I adhere to my own opinion that this is not the case with the majority of those who object to its recitation in church, and that, with a few exceptions, as in your lordship's instance, the objection to the Creed arises either from ignorance and prejudice, or from a repudiation of all authority in matters of religious belief.'

It will be seen from the above that, while Lord Halifax accepts the explanations of the Bishop of Worcester, and is assured that the doctrines contained in the 'Quicunque' are not a stumbling-block to the Bishop, his lordship nevertheless adheres to his own opinion respecting the majority of those who are opposed to its recitation in the Church. The accusation that the objection 'arises either from ignorance and prejudice, or from a repudiation of all authority in matters of religious belief,' is a sweeping and severe one, and must include Clergy as well as Lay people. Those who object to its recitation do so, we believe, not on the ground of any objection to its doctrines as such, and so far as they touch upon the Eternal Verities, but to its 'Monitory' clauses, and particularly the harsh language in which they are couched. And if the severe accusation of Lord Halifax be meant to include Clergy, we beg leave to say that the Clergy of the Church of England, taken as a whole, can scarcely be described as ignorant; and since they have in most cases received a fairly liberal education, they are not necessarily inclined to prejudice. And experience seems to show that those who are most ready to 'repudiate all authority,' even 'in matters of religious belief,' are those with whom his lordship is allied.

The many questions as to its Authorship, Age, Place of Origin, and Original language, together with its Doctrinal Significances, have furnished the theological gladiators with opportunities of displaying their powers of attack and methods of defence, and doughty partisans on every side have exerted all their strength in the sphere of polemics. And yet its Authorship remains, and most probably must for ever remain, shrouded in mystery. It seems to be 'without beginning of days or end of life,' for 'when the composition appears as a document of authority for the first time, it is cited in its completeness' (*cf.* Lumby, p. 190). 'The origin of this remarkable production,' says Dr. Schaff ('History of the Church,' vol. iii., p. 695), 'is veiled in mysterious darkness.'

From the eighth century, and perhaps from the days of Isidore, until the seventeenth century (A.D. 1642) and the days of Gerrard Vossius, it was unhesitatingly accepted as the genuine production of the great St. Athanasius. But the foundation upon which the tradition rested was a very slender one, and altogether unequal to the strain which literary criticism and historical investigation had to bring to bear upon it. Exactly as we should have expected, under this trial the foundation gave way, and 'the tradition,' as Dr. Schaff says, as quoted above, 'which, since the eighth century, has attributed it to St. Athanasius as the great champion of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity has long ago been abandoned; for in the writings of Athanasius and his contemporaries, and even in the acts of the third and fourth Œcumenical Councils, no trace of it is found.' And Professor Lumby says: 'Although it is cited' (in its early days) 'as the work of the father whose name it has since for the most part borne, it was not brought to light for many centuries after his death.' On what foundation, then, did that tradition rest which attributed it to St. Athanasius? It appears to have rested almost entirely upon a passage in Gregory Nazianzen's Oration (xxi.) 'In laudem Athanasii,' and which is as follows:

Καὶ ὁ τῷ πολλῶ τῶν πατέρων ἀριθμῷ περὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ἔχα-
ρίσθη πρότερον, τοῦτο περὶ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος αὐτὸς ἐμπ-
νευσθεὶς ὕστερον καὶ δῶρον βασιλικὸν ὄντως καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς

τῷ βασιλεῖ προσενεγκὼν ἔγγραφον τὴν εὐσέβειαν κατὰ τῆς ἀγράφου καινοτομίας.

Slender as was such a foundation on which to rest so weighty an ascription, the passage was one, as Professor Lumby remarks (p. 191), 'which was capable of being used as evidence, when such evidence happened to be needed, that a Creed was written by St. Athanasius, and known to his contemporaries. That such an interpretation was put upon it, and that it was considered to warrant the acceptance of the "Quicumque" as the production of St. Athanasius, may be seen by the note on the above passage in one of the early editions of St. Gregory's works. The editor affirms without questioning that the Creed alluded to is that noble Symbol of Athanasius wherein the holy man embodied the teaching of the Catholic Faith' (Scholia to Bill's Translation of Gregory Nazianzen, Cologne, 1570). The Definition of the Sixth General Council (the third of Constantinople), held A.D. 681, may also have helped on the ascription to St. Athanasius. In this Definition the following is found: 'For according to the most wise Athanasius, it was needful that the will of His flesh should be moved, but that it should be subjected to this Divine Will' (Routh, 'Scriptorum, Eccles.,' Opuscula ii., p. 241, quoted by Lumby, p. 262). Now, as the 'Bouhier' Commentary, to be noticed hereafter, contains language evidently drawn from the Definition of the Sixth General Council, it is not surprising that the writer of this Commentary ascribes the composition of the Creed to St. Athanasius. The matter is referred to by Mr. Ommaney ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 510, note).

Professor Lumby himself appeared to incline to the opinion that St. Athanasius put forth some Symbol. He says (p. 190): 'The active share taken by St. Athanasius in the Nicene Council renders it not improbable that some Symbol was put forth by him.' But against this we may quote Mr. Radcliffe, who, in the Preface of his book 'On the Athanasian Creed,' p. xix, after quoting part of the Epistle of St. Athanasius from Socrates ('Hist. Eccles.,' lib. ii., cap. xxxix.), where that Father finds great fault with the authors of the dated Creed of Ariminum, because they asserted that it represented the Catholic Faith, remarks: 'He who

thus quarrelled with this application of the word "Catholic" we may be sure would not have suffered his name to be prefixed to a Creed as its author.' At the time when the tradition appears to have been first launched that St. Athanasius was the author of the 'Quicunque,' literary criticism was practically non-existent; while credulity in such matters was so strong and well nourished that there would be small risk of the ascription being called in question, or that the tradition, when once started, would be in danger of perishing by an untimely death. According to Schaff, Isidore was the first to attribute the 'Quicunque' to St. Athanasius. Dr. Waterland endeavoured to carry back the date to A.D. 670, and for this purpose quoted a Canon found among the Canons of Autun, the wording of which is as follows: 'Si quis Presbyter, Diaconus, Sub-diaconus, vel Clericus Symbolum quod Sancto inspirante Spiritu Apostoli tradiderunt, et Fidem Sancti Athanasii Præsulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit; ab Episcopo condemnetur' (Waterland, 'Critical History of the Athanasian Creed,' p. 15, note). It is by no means clear or certain that this particular Canon belongs to the Council of Autun of A.D. 670. In Harduin's 'Acts of the Councils,' vol. iii., p. 1016, seven Canons are given under the title 'Concilium Augustodunense Sancti Leodegarii Augustodunæ civitatis Episcopi circa annum Christi DCLXX.' Immediately after, but standing apart, occurs the Canon quoted above, entitled 'Canones Augustodunenses, hira I.' By a note in the margin it is explained that it has been taken from a collection of Canons in the library of the monastery of St. Benignus at Dijon. Hira I. obviously means number 1; but Canon I. in the list of seven mentioned above is different; consequently we are driven to the conclusion that it belongs to a different list, and emanated from some other Council, and perhaps some other bishop. Mr. Ommaney, in his 'Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed' (Clarendon Press, 1897), pp. 53-66, has discussed this matter fully, and although he inclines to the belief that it is a genuine Canon of the Council held under Leodegar, A.D. 670, yet finds its omission from several manuscripts and its position in others, a sufficient reason for devoting some fourteen pages to explanations of how it *might* have been omitted from some, and placed in peculiar positions

in others. And, after all, he does not appear to be so clearly convinced of its genuineness as being of the date A.D. 670 as to leave no room for doubt, for he says (p. 62): 'But whether it were his or not is a point of no material importance in regard to the value of its testimony to the antiquity of the "Quicunque."' For if it was not drawn up at a synod held under Leodegar, it must have emanated from some other Autun synod held prior or subsequently to his episcopate, but still in the seventh century.' But even if this contention be true, there is no proof that it referred to the whole of the composition known to us as the 'Quicunque.' We cannot find evidence that the Athanasian Creed as a whole was in existence at that time (*cf.* Waterland, p. 18; Lumby, p. 209; Ffoulkes, 287 *et seq.*). Mr. Ffoulkes discovered in the Herovall collection, which Mr. Ommaney ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 58) contends is based upon the Angers collection, two lists of Canons of Autun; one list, *from which this particular Canon is absent*, having attached to it the following words: *Consensio et confirmatio Leodegarii Episcopi.* To the Canons included in this list, then, the bishop gave his consent and ratification. But the longer list, in which this Canon is included, has the title 'Augustodunenses Sancti Leodegarii Episcopi.' Does not this prove that this Canon must have been included at some date subsequently to the bishop's death? He certainly was not called Sanctus while alive! The next date given by Waterland is A.D. 760. Here again we must contest his assumption. Regino, Abbot of Prum, in Germany, died A.D. 915, and in his works there are found, among other collections, some Articles of Inquiry to be addressed to the Clergy. Baluzius, who edited his works, was of the opinion that these Articles were of the date of Boniface, Bishop of Mentz, who died A.D. 754. Relying solely upon the opinion of Baluzius, Waterland placed these articles as of the date A.D. 760. The article referred to runs thus: 'Si Sermonem Athanasii Episcopi de Fide Sanctæ Trinitatis, cujus initium est, Quicunque vult salvus esse, memoriter teneat' ('Regino de Discipl. Eccl.,' lib. i.). No date is given with any of the Canons in Regino's Treatise, and so far as this particular Canon is concerned it may be of any date prior to the death of Regino. Indeed, it appears to us that the nearer to the

time of Regino this Canon can be placed, the more likely is the date to be correct. In the early part of the ninth century, anything with an odour of antiquity attaching to it would be very acceptable to the active ecclesiastics who guided the destinies of the Church in Gaul. And even Mr. Ommaney does not find himself able to assert positively that it was ascribed to St. Athanasius before this time (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 395). He says (p. 63): 'The title "Fides sancti Athanasii," or the like, was commonly applied to the "Quicunque," and that beyond a question as early as the ninth century.' The title in Regino's Treatise refers to a Discourse of Athanasius upon the Faith of the Holy Trinity. But such a title is only applicable to the first portion of the Athanasian Creed as we know it. The second portion could not be described under such a title. Was the first portion in circulation separately as a Tract which was ascribed to St. Athanasius, and afterwards combined with another compilation to make one Treatise, which retained the original ascriptive title? If this were allowed to be the case, it would simplify matters very much indeed. For when we proceed to examine the later evidence which Waterland brings, we find that the quotations cited by him are in the cases of Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and perhaps 'The monks of Mount Olivet,' all from that portion of the composition which we call the first part. Mr. Ommaney ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 24) asserts that Hincmar quotes from both parts of the Creed. He says: 'In the *De una et non trina Deitate*, Hincmar quotes necessarily from the first part of the Creed only, that being alone relevant to his purpose; but in his "Explanatio in ferculum Salomonis," which refers to the Incarnation as well as the Trinity, he quotes from both parts.' It would have been of great interest and service if Mr. Ommaney had given the quotations. Professor Lumby remarks (p. 230), that 'All the evidence which can be derived from the study of the MSS. and ancient testimonies seem to indicate that the Creed was not always of its present extent.' But this is somewhat of a digression.

To return to the subject immediately in hand. We find some composition referred to as the work of St. Athanasius by several writers, *e.g.*, 'The Monks of Mount Olivet,'

A.D. 809; Bishop Hatto, A.D. 820; Agobard, A.D. 820; Hincmar, A.D. 852, and whose quotations from the Creed are all taken from the first portion; Bertram, A.D. 864; Anscharius, A.D. 865; Æneas of Paris, A.D. 868; Adelbert, A.D. 871. There is no need to trace any further, for the tradition had by this time become so well established that it was in no immediate danger of suffering extinction. But when in the Renaissance that began in the sixteenth century the spirit of inquiry was set afloat, and, stimulated by every fresh discovery, began to search into this and that, and to question even the sacred things of man's belief, among the rude shocks that the theological world received was this one of discovering that there were very grave reasons for doubt respecting the authorship of St. Athanasius's Creed. Gerard Vossius in 1642 published his Treatise '*De Tribus Symbolis*,' in which he conclusively showed that so far from the Creed being of the date of St. Athanasius, it was composed in the eighth or ninth century, in the time of Pepin or of Charles the Great, and probably by some French divine. It was startling, no doubt, and disturbed the ecclesiastical doves; but the conclusion had been arrived at after a patient and painstaking investigation, which had been conducted on scientific principles. Vossius had, in fact, employed the science of literary criticism, and to good purpose. But the result was disturbing, and for a considerable period thereafter the air was charged with scepticism. For if it was not the composition of Athanasius, of what value was it, or to whom could it be ascribed? In 1675 Paschasius Quesnel, a celebrated French divine, published his famous edition of Pope Leo's works, with several very valuable Dissertations of his own. In his fourteenth Dissertation he enters into a particular inquiry about the author of this Creed. He ascribes it to Vigilius Tapsensis, the African. About fifteen years before him Labbé had made reference to some of his own time, who had also ascribed it to Vigilius, but with whom he did not agree. In 1680 Henricus Heideggeras, in his eighteenth Dissertation, ascribed it to Vigilius; the learned Dr. Cave also attributed it to Vigilius; Dupin in his '*Ecclesiastical History*' also ascribes it to Vigilius. But in 1693, Joseph Anthelmi attacked the opinion of Quesnel. He ascribed the Creed

to Vincentius Lirinensis, who flourished A.D. 434. The opinion of Tillemont (A.D. 1695) was that it was not written by St. Athanasius, but that it was as old as the sixth century, or older.

The famous edition of St. Athanasius's works published by Montfauçon in A.D. 1698 contained in tome ii. an excellent Dissertation upon this Creed. His conclusion is that it is not the work of St. Athanasius, nor yet of Vigilius, nor even of Vincentius; but likely enough to belong to the age of Vincentius, and probably by a Gallican writer or writers. In the same year (1698) Muratorius published a Commentary upon this Creed, which he had found in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. This Commentary was ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus, who was Bishop of Poitiers in the sixth century. The conclusion of Muratorius was that Venantius Fortunatus was the certain author of the Commentary, and that he might possibly be the author of the Creed as well. The title of this Commentary in the Ambrosian Library is: 'Expositio Fidei Catholicæ Fortunati;' while another copy at Oxford has the title, 'Expositio in fide Catholica' (Bodleian MS., Junius, 25). These two copies differ materially from each other; the older or Oxford manuscript is much shorter than the later or Ambrosian manuscript. In the Oxford copy the words of clause 2 are not found; in neither is there any explanation of the clause and in neither copy is there any reference to, or explanation of, the clauses 28, 29: 'Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de Trinitate sentiat. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.' Waterland himself remarked that some of the words attributed by the Milanese manuscript to Fortunatus, who died *circa* A.D. 609, appear to have been really copied from Alcuin, who died A.D. 804, but he took no further notice of the fact, and appears to have failed to see what discredit it throws upon his estimate of the Ambrosian manuscript. Venantius is known to have written an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, and this exposition of the Athanasian Creed has been ascribed to him, mainly because it was discovered bound up in the same volume with the Commentary upon the earlier Creed. So Professors Lumby, Swainson, and others. The latest authority upon this sub-

ject also abandons the idea of this Commentary being by Venantius Fortunatus. Mr. Ommaney, p. 166, says: 'But there is great diversity of opinion upon the subject, the authorship of Venantius Fortunatus being denied for instance by the writers of the "Literary History of France": it is also denied by the editor of his works, Michael Angelus Luchi, who considers that the style of our Commentary is dissimilar from that generally observable in the writings of Venantius; and recently Professor Heurtley, who at first accepted without hesitation the opinion of Muratori and Waterland, afterwards avouched himself to "be less satisfied than formerly" upon the point. It must be acknowledged that the evidence for the authorship of Venantius is not conclusive. It rests upon a single manuscript, and that a manuscript not earlier than the eleventh century, with one exception the latest of the manuscripts in which the Commentary is found.'

In 1712 Fabricius collected in his '*Bibliotheca Græca*' a summary account of the opinions of the learned relating to this Creed. He was convinced that it was not by Athanasius, but that it was produced long after in the fifth century, written originally in Latin, and afterwards translated into Greek. In the same year (1712) Le Quien published a new edition of '*Damascen*,' in which he discussed the age and authorship of this composition. He believed it to have been composed by Pope Anastasius I., who succeeded to the Papal Chair, A.D. 398. He supported this opinion by quoting from authors in whose works reference is made to some exposition of the Faith by Anastasius. During the period 1642-1720 there were many works written upon this subject, but only by FIVE authors, and these not considered of importance, was the composition thought to be by Athanasius. All the rest were agreed that the original language of the '*Quicumque*' was Latin (*cf.* Lumby, '*History of the Creeds*,' p. 281). Waterland himself, after having gone through and reviewed their evidences, took leave to add one more conjecture as to its authorship. He says, cap. viii.: 'And as others have taken the liberty of naming such author or authors as to them appeared most likely to have made the Creed, so have I in my turn, not scrupling to add one more to the number. The sum, then, of what I have presumed to advance upon probable conjecture, in a

case which will not admit of full and perfect evidence, is this: That Hilary, once Abbot of Lerins, and next Bishop of Arles, about the year 430 composed the Exposition of Faith which now bears the name of the Athanasian Creed.'

The grounds upon which this conjecture was built must have appeared, even to Dr. Waterland, scarcely all that could be desired; and that they have appeared to his successors quite unsatisfactory may be gathered from the fact, that since his time no one has come forward to support his conjecture (Lumby, p. 282). It has been established beyond all doubt that St. Athanasius was not the author of the composition, and we may say that it was not until the eighth, or more probably the ninth century, that any composition was ascribed to him of which any portion finds a place in our present 'Quicunque.' Indeed, as has been mentioned, Vossius asserted, and his position is a strong one even yet, 'that the first time it was produced under the name of Athanasius, at least with any assurance and confidence of its being his, was in the year 1233, when Pope Gregory IX.'s Legates pleaded it at Constantinople in favour of the Procession against the Greeks' (Vossius, '*De Tribus Symbolis*,' 1642; Waterland, chap. i., ed. 1724).

The tradition, once launched, soon became steady, and we are in nowise surprised to find that after the Creed had once been attributed to the Bishop of Alexandria, that of the thirty-four ancient testimonies brought by Waterland, no fewer than twenty-five quote the Creed as the work of Athanasius; two call it '*Psalmus*,' three '*Quicunque vult*,' etc. The first trustworthy date at which we meet with any document under the name of the Creed of St. Athanasius is A.D. 809 (Lumby, p. 198), and even then we do not know what was the nature of the Creed, or what were its contents. It is simply referred to as such by the monks of Mount Olivet in that year, as containing the Filioque, which they had heard sung in the Imperial chapel. The Epistle of the monks can be seen in '*Baluzii Miscellanea*,' tom. ii., p. 84. The Athanasian authorship then is abandoned, and with the question of authorship there is also inextricably bound up the question of its age. The truth undoubtedly is that we owe the authorship to no one man, but that phrases which appear in the Creed have been gathered from the works of

such men as Augustine, Leo Magnus, Vincentius Lerinensis, the preambles and discussions of Councils of Toledo, A.D. 589-638, and the speech of Paulinus of Aquileia at Forum Julii. These phrases were the common property of the Church, and the 'literary communism' which then existed (to use Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs's happy description) absolutely precludes the possibility of the discovery of the names, either of the author of the original draft document, or of those who appropriated, enlarged and altered it.'

CHAPTER XVI.

WHAT THEN IS ITS AGE?

ON this point, as well as respecting authorship, there have been various guesses. It has been left to our own age to make the most thorough investigation into this matter in a scientific manner. Still, the question has not been settled—far from it ; for the latest production of an eminent authority—Mr. Prebendary Ommaney—ascribes the authorship to St. Vincent of Lerins. He states his case very carefully and soberly in chapter iii. of the second part of his recent work, but does not appear satisfied that the reasons given by him are quite conclusive. He sums up, therefore (p. 390) with : ‘ I do not venture to assert that the evidence I have produced is conclusive and demonstrative. It is a case in which we could scarcely look for such evidence. But I think I may without exaggeration describe it as highly probable : and this is no small matter, if Bishop Butler was right in saying that to us probability is the very guide of life. It is not superfluous to add that of all the authors to whom the Creed has been attributed, Vincent of Lerins is the only one to whom it has been attributed with any degree of probability. I have previously alluded to the fact that the evidence alleged by Waterland for the authorship of Hilary of Arles does not bear examination. The same may be said of the hypothesis of Quesnel, which ascribed the Creed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and of the theory broached about five-and-twenty years ago by Mr. Ffoulkes, which represented it as compiled by Paulinus, Archbishop of Aquileia, or a little before the year 800.’

It will not be out of place to inquire here on what foundation the ascription of the authorship of the ‘ Quicunque ’ to

St. Vincent of Lerins rests? It may be answered at once : upon a similarity of language employed in the 'Commonitorium' written by him and the language of the Creed. But the same might be said with at least as much force for an Augustinian authorship. And Mr. Ommaney acknowledges that 'it [the 'Quicumque'] re-echoes in all its parts the teaching of St. Augustine, both in substance and language,' and that the author 'must have been familiar with the writings of that great doctor.' Now, upon our author's own showing, it is clear that if St. Vincent of Lerins did compile the 'Quicumque,' he was (to use Mr. Ommaney's own phraseology) 'not an original writer, but a compiler and inanipulator of earlier materials.'

Waterland produced from the writings of St. Augustine a parallel for nearly every verse of the 'Quicumque,' while from the work of Vincentius he produced only six such parallels.

Mr. Ommaney has somewhat extended this list, and has produced ELEVEN passages, drawn from caps. xiii., xiv. and xvi. of the 'Commonitorium.' Of these, nine are from cap. xiii., and the other two, which are not quite so relevant, are from caps. xiv. and xvi. In order that our readers may form their own judgment upon the value of these parallels, we subjoin them :

Athanasian Creed.

'Fides autem Catholica hæc est,
et unum Deum in Trinitate et
Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur :
Neque confundentes personas neque,
Substantiam separantes' (verses 3, 4).

The parallel to this is :

Commonitorium primum.

'Ecclesia Catholica . . . et unam
Divinitatem in Trinitatis plenitudine
et Trinitatis æqualitatem in una
atque eadem maiestate veneratur' (cap. xiii.).

Cap. xvi. supplies another passage, as follows : 'Unum Deum in Trinitatis plenitudine et item Trinitatis, æqualitatem in una Divinitate veneratur ; ut neque singularitas,

substantiæ personarum confundat proprietatem, neque item Trinitatis distinctio Unitatem separet Deitatis.'

The next instance is a parallel for verses 5 and 6, which in the Creed are: 'Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti: sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas, æqualis gloria, coæterna maiestas.'

In the 'Commonitorium' we find (cap. xiii.): 'Quia silicet alia est persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti; sed tamen Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti non alia et alia, sed una eademque natura.'

For verse 28 of the Creed, which reads thus, 'Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et homo est,' we have the following as parallels: 'Ecclesia Catholica et de Deo et de Salvatore recta sentiens' (cap. xiii.). Also, 'Ecclesia Catholica . . . unum Christum Jesum, non duos, eundemque Deum pariter atque hominem confitetur' (cap. xiii.).

In the same way verse 29 of the Creed, 'Deus ex substantia Patris . . . homo ex substantia matris,' is paralleled by, 'In uno eodemque Christo duæ substantiæ sunt; sed una divina, altera humana; una ex Patre Deo, altera ex matre Virgine; . . . una consubstantialis Patri, altera consubstantialis matri; unus tamen idemque, Christus in utraque, substantia' (cap. xiii.).

Previously, on p. 379, our author has quoted St. Vincent thus: 'Idem ex Patre ante sæcula genitus, idem in sæculo ex Matre generatus' ('Commonitorium,' i., cap. xiii.).

'Perfectus homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens' (v. 30) is paralleled by, 'Perfectus homo . . . In homine plena humanitas. Plena, inquam, quæ animam simul habeat et carnem, sed carnem, veram, nostram, maternam, animam vero intellectu præditam, mente ac ratione pollentem' (cap. xiii.). Also, 'Unus idemque Petrus, unus idemque Paulus, ex duplici diversaque subsistens animi corporisque natura' (cap. xiii.).

Similarly the parallel to verse 33, which reads, 'Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed adsumptione humanitatis in Deum,' is given as, 'Unam personam . . . quia mutabile non est Verbum Dei ut ipsum verteretur in carnem' (cap. xiii.). Also, 'Verbum Deus absque ulla

sui conversione . . . non confundendo, non imitando factus est homo, sed subsistendo . . . in se perfecti hominis suscipiendo naturam' (cap. xiv.).

Three other parallelisms are given as under :

For verse 31, 'Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem.'

Commonitorium primum.

'In uno eodemque Christo duæ substantiæ sunt : sed una divina altera humana, . . . una co-æterna æqualis Patri, altera ex tempore et minor Patre . . . Non alter Christus Deus, alter homo . . . non alter æqualis Patri, alter minor Patre, sed unus idemque Christus Deus et homo . . . idem Patri et æqualis et minor' (cap. xiii.).

Again, verse 34 of the Creed : 'Unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ, sed unitate personæ.'

Commonitorium primum.

'Unus autem non corruptibili nescio qua divinitatis et humanitatis confusione sed integra et singulari quadam unitatem personæ.'

'Altera substantia divinitatis, altera humanitatis' (cap. xiii.).

Lastly, verse 35 of the Creed : 'Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.'

Commonitorium primum.

'Altera substantia divinitatis, altera humanitatis ; sed tamen deitas et humanitas non alter et alter, sed unus idemque Christus ; . . . sicut in homine aliud caro et aliud anima, sed unus idemque homo anima et caro' (cap. xiii.).

Now, what do these parallelisms show ? At most they show that St. Vincent had (as everyone is willing to admit that he had) a close acquaintance with the works of St. Augustine. But the writings of St. Augustine and the phraseology of the Creed have a much closer resemblance than have the writings of St. Vincent and the phraseology of the Creed. Take for one example verse 35 of the Creed, and compare it with that passage of St. Augustine's 'Tract. in Joh. Evangelium,' lxxviii. 3, where he says : 'Sicut

enim unus est homo anima rationalis et caro ; sic unus est Christus Deus et homo.' And with regard to the phrase *in sæculo*, we fail to see how it helps on the Vincentian authorship. It occurs in the 'Commonitorium,' i., xiii., it is true—'Idem ex Patre ante sæcula genitus, idem in sæculo ex Matre generatus.' But this phrase was not the exclusive property of Vincentius ; it was an expression in regular use before A.D. 451 (*cf.* Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 221). Pelagius has in his Creed, *in fine sæculorum*. In the anathemas of the Lateran Council, A.D. 649, we find the words, *in ultimis sæculorum*. St. Augustine has, 'Deus ante omnia sæcula, homo in nostro sæculo' ('Enchiridion,' cap. xxxv.). Fulgentius, who was made Bishop of Ruspe, in Africa, A.D. 507, has, 'Unus atque idem Deus, Dei Filius, natus ante sæcula et natus in sæculo' ('De Fide Liber,' cap. ii., sec. 11 ; quoted by Mr. Ommaney, p. 381). St. Vincent, then, possessed no monopoly with regard to the use of this phrase, and if the phrase became uncommon after the end of the fifth century, it was because one more suitable to men's needs was found to supply its place. We are more than willing to admit that 'the two verbal coincidences exclude the hypothesis that the two documents, viz., the "Commonitorium" of St. Vincent and the "Quicunque," in which they appear, could have been drawn up by different authors independently one of another, the earlier of the two being unknown to the author of the latter' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 381).

We believe that the work of St. Vincent contributed its share in the formation of the 'Quicunque' ; but this is not our author's view. He says (pp. 381, 382) : 'It seems to me also improbable, though in a less degree, that two such peculiarities should have been copied from one document to the other. The only alternative remaining is, that both documents were by the same hand, that the author of the "Commonitorium" was also the author of the Athanasian Creed.' We are forcibly reminded by this latter conclusion of the theory of Muratori, who, in treating of the Milanese MS. of the Fortunatus Commentary, concluded that *Venantius* Fortunatus was the certain author of the Commentary, and very possibly of the Creed as well ! But there is one other point on which a few words are necessary

with respect to this Vincentian authorship. The parallels produced—and it may be presumed that, in the hands of so able an advocate, the best case which is possible has been made out on behalf of St. Vincent—when compared with the condemnatory clauses existent in the Creed, show a very marked weakness. The strongest utterance produced (see pp. 387, 388) is as nothing compared with our warning clauses :

‘It is very necessary that the course of prophetic and apostolic interpretation should be guided in accordance with the rule of Ecclesiastical and Catholic doctrine ; in the bosom of the Catholic Church, also, we should be specially careful to hold that which has been believed everywhere, always and by all.’

Again : ‘Keep the talent of the Catholic Faith undefiled and undiminished ; that which has been committed to thee, take heed that it abide with thee, that it be handed on by thee.’

And again : ‘This is the proper duty of Catholics, to keep the deposits of the holy Fathers, and the things committed to them, to condemn profane novelties, and, as the Apostle said, and again said, “If anyone preach unto you what is contrary to that which has been received, let him be anathema.”’

Where are the strong utterances of our warning clauses ? They are not here, nor is there anything which approaches the severity of their tone. Yet our author is persuaded that they are of Vincentian authorship, for he says (p. 388) : ‘In particular it is plain from these utterances [those cited above from St. Vincent] of St. Vincent of Lerins, that the condemnatory clauses are not alien from his mind, and might be attributed to him without any improbability.’

We leave the reader to judge for himself, by comparing the two documents. For ourselves, we may say that we can see no trace of the ‘damnatory’ clauses of the ‘Quicumque’ in the utterances of St. Vincent in his ‘Commonitorium.’

This theory of Vincentian authorship was the theory of Anthelmus, A.D. 1693, and is only a resuscitated opinion of two centuries ago. It is surely little to be wondered at that the language of an ecclesiastical writer like Vincent should bear strong resemblance to the writings of the man (St.

Augustine) who undoubtedly was his model, or that, on the other hand, the language of eighth or ninth century documents should reproduce many expressions of the documents of the fifth century. To many with the close of the fifth century the age of the Œcumenical Councils came to an end; and besides this, it was not an age of literary activity. Men were engaged in other and grosser kinds of work; and it was not until the age of Charlemagne that the revival in letters took place. The question of the age of the 'Quicunque' remains therefore still unsettled; but, as the result of much controversy and consequent research, the question seems to have been reduced to its narrowest possible limits. This refers to its age as a whole, for it is not attempted to be denied; on the contrary, it is distinctly asserted that some part of it may be, and probably is, as old as the fifth century. The whole composition has been subjected to a close and thorough scrutiny, both as regards the language and phrases employed and its doctrinal contents. Every available document has been subjected to a rigorous criticism; every fact has been marshalled, and as far as possible every material factor, and perhaps, it should be added, many that are not material, have been stated with clearness and perspicuity. The manuscript evidence, which must be considered an important factor in the case, occupied, quite naturally, in Dr. Waterland's treatise a prominent place. His successors have rightly followed on the same lines. For in the inquiry as to what the date of this composition may be, if it can be ascertained at all, or even approximately ascertained, the manuscript evidence must be accorded due weight. It may of course be the case that the oldest text is represented not in original manuscripts—these having perished—but in some version of or Commentary upon the original. And we hold it to be true that the shorter the form and the less polished the language of the document, the more likely is it to represent the original. Here then lies a case for investigation: What is the direct manuscript evidence for the date of this Creed?

According to Mr. Ommaney, chap. iii., p. 93 *et seq.* of his 'Critical Dissertation,' the earliest manuscript which contains the Athanasian Creed is, so far as is known, one

which is kept in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Waterland described the same manuscript in chap. iv. of his 'Critical History,' but did not put it down as the oldest manuscript. That honour he reserved for the manuscript which is known to us as the Utrecht Psalter. This manuscript Waterland had not seen; and his opinion was formed by reading Usher's account of it. We know now that he was mistaken as to the age of the manuscript. The Milanese manuscript described by Mr. Ommaney as 'the earliest known' has no title. It originally belonged to the famous monastery of Bobbio, in High Lombardy, which was founded by St. Columbanus, A.D. 613. It is written in an Irish hand, which is not to be wondered at, considering that the monastery was of Irish origin. There seems to be no good reason for supposing, as Dr. Ceriani of the Ambrosian Library at Milan does, that the manuscript was written in Ireland. The manuscript consists of a few leaves, quarto size, and is known by the sign O 212. Muratori, who published his 'Anecdota' in 1698, was of the opinion that it was 'most ancient, written a thousand years ago and more' (Muratori, tom. ii., pp. 8, 224). Montfauçon, however, who both saw and examined the manuscript in 1698, declared it to be of the eighth century. The copy of the Creed in this manuscript differs very much from our present copies. There are variations or omissions in about twenty-five out of the forty clauses; and Professor Lumby is probably right when he says (p. 222) that 'this manuscript marks the transition stage of the "Quicumque."' The *variantes lectiones* of this manuscript are given by Waterland, chap. ix., and also by Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' Appendix E., pp. 472 *et seq.* It is unnecessary to give them here at length, but there appears to be good reason for saying that the manuscript is of a date subsequent to the controversy on the Procession of the Holy Ghost. For in verse 22, after *sed procedens*, this manuscript has added, 'Patri et Filio co-æternus est.' Such an amplification would scarcely have been felt necessary had not some question been raised on the subject. It has points of likeness with the Colbertine manuscript, to be described hereafter—as, *e.g.*, in verses 30 and 35, *rationalis* is used for *rationalis*, and in verse 33 both manuscripts have *in carne* and *in Deo* instead of the *in carnem* and *in*

Deum of our version. In verse 36 it omits *tertiâ die*. The opinion that it belongs to a date subsequent to the Processionist controversy is referred to by Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' pp. 409, 410, and he expresses great surprise at Professor Lumby's inference. But the point of the contention appears to be missed by him; for after saying that 'after the words *sed procedens* the Milan manuscript adds, "*Patri et Filio co-æternus est*,"' and that the addition is supported by no other manuscript, he goes on to account for the addition by pointing out that the words of the addition are found in various other documents which are found in this same Codex. Our opinion is that the manuscript belongs either to a late period of the eighth century or the early part of the ninth century. Professor Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 223, says: 'It may even be as late as A.D. 850. At the close of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries all the most able men in the literary world of Europe were engaged in the great controversy of the Procession.' An amplification such as the one under discussion seems to be a natural product during such a controversy.

The Utrecht Psalter, about which so much has been written, is probably quite as old as the manuscript above described. Waterland took it for the oldest manuscript of this Creed. It was originally described by Archbishop Usher, who had seen it in the Cotton Library. For a considerable period this manuscript disappeared, but was eventually rediscovered in the University Library, Utrecht. Hence its present name. It is a Gallican Psalter, containing, among other things, a copy of the Athanasian Creed. It bears an inscription, '*Bibliothecæ urbis Trajectinæ donavit D. de Ridder*.' Its contents are (1) the Psalter (Gallican) in which the Creed is found. (2) Some blank folios, after which comes a copy of St. Jerome's prologue, and this is followed by a very ancient fragment of the Gospels. (3) Originally in the same volume with the above there was a charter of King Hlothair, to which the date A.D. 679 has been assigned. This charter was extracted before the disappearance of the volume, and is now in the British Museum. It must be clearly understood that the connection existing between these various manuscripts is solely one of accident, due to their having been bound up together by Sir Richard Cotton, and that the

date assigned to any one of them is not necessarily a clue to any of the others. Usher's opinion was that the manuscript was of the date A.D. 600. The late Sir T. Duffus Hardy, at the request of the then Master of the Rolls, Lord Romilly, undertook an examination of this manuscript after its rediscovery. His opinion was that it was a work of the latter part of the sixth century. The report which he presented was of a very elaborate description, and yet it was not all that could be desired ; for he did not examine the original manuscript, but based his opinion upon examination of photographs of *portions* of the Psalter. Since then the manuscript has been brought to England, and reproduced by the autotype process, and consequently it is possible to obtain more reliable evidence on the various points connected with it. The fragment of the Gospels is, according to Professor Lumby, p. 216, of much greater antiquity than the rest of the Psalter. This is indicated, he says, by 'the larger and bolder character of the handwriting of the Gospels together with the absence of abbreviations, and the compression of words into smaller space by lowering the height of the terminal letters, as well as the absence of punctuation.' The punctuation, and the want of it, came under the notice of Sir T. D. Hardy ; but he had started with a false premise, and arrived at a wrong conclusion. He assumed that all the documents in the volume were of the same age, and remarked that the punctuation was not carried on throughout the manuscript. But with regard to the Psalter in which the 'Quicunque' occurs, the punctuation is found on every page of it. The parchment, too, of the Gospels is much lighter in colour than that of the Psalter, and abbreviations are found in the Psalter which, so says Professor Lumby (p. 216), are not found so early as the sixth century. And a fatal objection to Usher's opinion is that in this very Psalter occurs, in the exact words as we have it, the Apostles' Creed.

Now, we have seen that it is not until the age of Pirininius, *circa* A.D. 750, that the Western Creed is found in its full form as we know it. How, then, are we to account for its being found in this Psalter, which some would have us believe is of the sixth century? Professor Lumby has pointed out (p. 217) that if such were the case, we should

have to suppose that this form of the Apostles' Creed was in existence for nearly two centuries before it became known or won its way to general use, but yet was found in a Psalter of great magnificence in the sixth century. This Psalter, moreover, was for some uncommon personage. Apart from the fact that the common people could not read, the splendour of this ancient book precludes the idea of its having been prepared for any but a very wealthy and prominent person. Professor Lumby sums up on the evidence of this manuscript thus: 'We therefore place its date in round numbers at A.D. 800, as the earliest possible time at which it could have been produced with its present contents' (p. 218). The librarian of the University of Utrecht thought it was of the date between A.D. 750 and A.D. 850. Two authorities of the British Museum have assigned it to the end of the eighth century; the Bodleian Librarian, Oxford, Rev. H. O. Coxe, assigned it to the beginning of the ninth century; while Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 124, says: 'In the face of this preponderance of palæographical authority it is impossible any longer to maintain that the Psalter possesses the high antiquity which Usher attributed to it. And yet if we turn for guidance to the advocates of a later date, their opinions take such a wide range and differ so much that it is difficult to base any definite conclusion upon them. The most definite conclusion we can arrive at seems to be that the Psalter was written either in the eighth or ninth century, and most probably belongs to the first half of the latter.' With this we entirely agree.

The manuscript which next claims our attention is the Colbertine, a copy of a much older document known as the Trèves manuscript, but which is not now to be found. Mr. Ommaney prefers to call this the Trèves fragment. However, it received its name of the Colbertine manuscript because it belonged originally to the Library of Colbert, the Minister of Louis XIV. This manuscript is admitted by all to belong to the eighth century. And we are told by Mr. Ommaney that 'the authors of the "*Nouveau Traité Diplomatique*" affirm that the Latinity and faulty spelling prove clearly enough that it was written before the revival of letters in the time of Charlemagne.'" In fact, all palæographers are agreed that it is a manuscript of the eighth century, and that it was

probably written between A.D. 730 and A.D. 760. This manuscript has the following inscription in red, written by the scribe who copied the document: 'Explicit synodum mundanum id est universale apud Calcedona.' Then follows a title, also in red: 'Hæc invini Treveris in uno libro scriptum sic incipiente Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et reliqua Domini nostri, Jesu Christi fideliter credat.' Then follows a rough draft of the latter portion of our 'Quicumque. Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 8, objects to this view, and says: 'This view is entirely erroneous; and it is specially necessary to note the error on account of the mischievous consequences with which it is fraught. The fragment, it is important to remember, is not a copy of the Athanasian Creed, nor yet of a part of it; but it is a copy of the conclusion of a Sermon delivered to Catechumens at the "Traditio Symboli"—the ceremony preparatory to baptism in which they were instructed in the Apostles' Creed [this, of course, can only apply to the practice of the Western Church, because the Apostles' Creed is quite a Western document]; and the preacher, as I have already said, therein gives an exposition of the doctrine of the Incarnation, which obviously, though not avowedly, is built upon the lines of the "Quicumque," and to a certain extent, indeed a large extent, employs its very language.'

We should prefer to say, for ourselves, that the fragment influenced the language of the Creed, and that the Creed to a large extent employed the language of the fragment. It is precisely our contention that originally—and this we have particularly learned from the 'Trèves fragment'—the object was not to set forth a Creed, but an exposition of the Creed accepted by the Church, a *Sermo* which should illustrate those passages of the Creed where the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation were only lightly touched upon, and upon which controversy had arisen. That this was the purpose of the writer of this 'Trèves fragment' is admitted by Mr. Ommaney. But our author's method of dealing with the errors of the text does not commend itself to us. That there are many errors of Latinity in this fragment is patent to all who have seen it. Let them all be treated alike. But our author, it seems to us, differentiates. For instance, on p. 6 we find, 'The reading *unitatem* may

be passed over as of no significance. Probably it was owing to the ignorance or carelessness of the scribe, and was not originally in the Sermon.' We do not demur to this in any way; but when 'the corrupt Latinity of the sixth or seventh centuries' in the use of the barbarism *erunt resurrecturi* is claimed to prove the very early existence of the 'Quicumque,' we ask why is it not attributed to an error of the scribe? The same remarks exactly apply to *ad inferos* and *ad inferna*. Mr. Ommaney insists that this fragment is not an autograph, and we share his opinion. May it not have happened in the course of copying that both mind and eye of the scribe wandered so that he wrote *erunt resurrecturi* instead of *resurrecturi sunt*, and *ad inferos* for *ad inferna*? And Mr. Ommaney himself says ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 401): 'Everyone is aware that the transposition of words and letters is a fertile cause of error in manuscripts' (see also p. 121 of the present volume). Be that as it may, we think that too much ought not to be made of verbal differences and mistakes in such a case as this. The Trèves fragment is an important document, for the existence of which we are devoutly thankful. We cannot share the opinion of Mr. Ommaney respecting the scribe who found this fragment at Trèves. Mr. Ommaney says ('Critical Dissertation,' pp. 342, 343): 'The scribe of the Paris manuscript' (it is kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, Latin 3836) 'does not seem to have regarded the document which he found at Trèves as one of recent or contemporaneous execution.'

And again, after allowing an interval of fifty years between the composition of the Sermon and the date of the Trèves fragment, and at least as long a time between the composition of the Creed and the date of the Sermon, we are asked to believe that, 'at the epoch when the Sermon was preached, the Athanasian Creed could not have been a recently-composed or unknown document. It had evidently then attained a certain degree of esteem, perhaps authority, as a manual of instruction; its language was familiar to the preacher; he would seem to have known it by heart' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 343). But if such were the case, could such an important document and composition, just at the time when the knowledge and use of it ought, according to

our author's view, to have been growing and extending, have so far dropped into disuse that at the end of fifty years, taking his own estimate, which we do not consider unreasonable, it appeared to the scribe who found it at Trèves in the light of a discovery? Yet such must have been the case; for it is quite evident that he did not know of its existence until that (to him) memorable day on which he found it in a book at Trèves. It evidently formed no part at that time of a Clerk's education, and the finder evidently considered that he had lighted on a prize, and that others would be glad to know of its existence. And, like the sensible man that he was, he forthwith copied it. Now, as to its contents: it does not contain all the 'Quicunque.' Beginning at verse 28, it goes on to the end, with the exception of verse 35, 'Nam sicut anima,' etc., which verse does not appear. In verse 29 occurs the expression *in sæculo*. Professor Lumby (p. 221) has pointed out that 'Dr. Swainson has argued from this, and not without reason, that the original, from which this Colbertine manuscript was taken, was written before the Council of Chalcedon. In the Canons of that Council, and in all authoritative documents of subsequent synods, this expression, *in sæculo*, is changed into *in novissimis diebus*, or some words of the like kind. Nor does the phrase *in sæculo* come into use again till it appears in the "Quicunque." But before A.D. 451 it was the expression regularly employed. There can be little doubt that this document is the groundwork of the latter half of the "Quicunque." The order of the sentences is the same, and, amid much diversity, there is a great similarity, and in one verse absolute identity of language.' The following is a copy of the text of the 'Quicunque' as found in this Colbertine manuscript:

'Est ergo Fides recta ut credamus et confitemur quia dominus Jesus Christus Dei filius deus pariter et homo est. Deus est de substantia Patris ante secula genitus, et homo de substantia matris in sæculo natus. Perfectus Deus, perfectus homo ex animâ rationabili et humana carne subsistens. Æqualis Patri secundum divinitatem minor Patri secundum humanitatem. Qui licet Deus sit homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. Unus autem non ex eo quod sit in carne conversa divinitas, sed quia est in deo adsumpta

dignanter humanitas. Unus Christus est non confusione substantiæ sed unitatem personæ [verse 35 omitted]. Qui secundum, fidem nostram passus est et mortuos ad inferna descendens, et die tertia resurrexit. Adque ad cœlos ascendit, ad dexteram Dei Patris sedet, sicut vobis in simbulo tradutum est; Inde ad judicandos vivos et mortuos credimus et speramus eum esse venturum. Ad cujus adventum erunt omnes homines sine dubio in suis corporibus resurrecturi et reddituri de factis propriis rationem. Ut qui bona egerunt eant in vitam æternam, qui mala in ignem æternum. Hæc est fides vera et Catholica quam omnes homo qui ad vitam æternam pervenire desiderat scire integræ debet et fideliter custodire.'

Such is the document. A transcription of it will be found in Lumby, pp. 219, 220, and also in Swainson, pp. 31-33; it will be found in facsimile in the publication of the Palæographical Society, and Prebendary Ommaney has copied the document exactly so far as punctuation and spelling are concerned. It will be found on p. 461 of his 'Critical Dissertation.'

It will be observed that the Damnatory Clauses are wanting, the solitary representative being exceedingly mild in comparison with the expressions contained in our version.

(4) King Athelstan's Psalter, as it is called, next claims our consideration. This is in the British Museum, marked 'Galba, A. xviii.' Waterland (cap. iv., p. 51) does not appear to have been satisfied that the date A.D. 703 was the correct one for this document. The Rule of the Calendar which occurs in the Psalter has doubtless, as Waterland suggested, been copied word for word from one of the date 703. On this ground of the Rule being of the date 703, Usher and Grabe were both of the opinion that the document ought to be assigned to this date. But, just as in the case of the Utrecht Psalter, different parts belong in fact to different dates, and the Calendar itself cannot belong to so early a date as 703, for embodied in it and in the same handwriting is a notice of the death of King Alfred, so that it is at least as late as A.D. 901. The Rule is written in a Saxon hand, while the body of the Psalter is in a German, and probably an earlier hand. And in addition to these things

we must add that the Apostles' Creed is contained in the Psalter in the same form, word for word, as it is found in Pirminius. Turning to the Athanasian Creed, which in this Psalter, says Waterland, is first ascribed to St. Athanasius, excepting only the Council of Autun, if we may depend upon the Canon ascribed to it, we find but few variations from our present text. This appears to us evidence of a later date, subsequent to the Ambrosian manuscript, where the text is, as we have seen, unsettled. The date of the Psalter cannot be, in our opinion, much, if any, older than A.D. 820. Of course, the Rule was written after A.D. 901, and is a separate work (*cf.* Lumby, pp. 204, 223). Mr. Ommaney remarks of this book ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 337) that it 'must have been written before 850 A.D., probably in Germany.'

(5) The St. Germain manuscript, which is at Paris (Sangermanensis, 1363'), is in some respects very much like the Ambrosian manuscript. It is somewhat nearer the settled text, but it has some remarkable variations from that text. Waterland has noted them with care, but only a very few need be given here. In verse 2 we have *invio-labilem* for *inviolatam*; in verse 19 *Deum ac Dominum* stands in the place of our *et Deum et Dominum*; in verse 29 there is *in sæculo genitus perfectus homo*, where our text has *in sæculo natus*; in verses 30 and 33 this manuscript agrees with the Colbertine in *rationabili*, and *in carne*, and *in Deo*; in verse 35, instead of *ad inferos* we find *ad infernos*, etc. Professor Lumby says (p. 225) the date of the St. Germain manuscript may be placed within the first twenty years of the ninth century.

(6) We now come to the manuscript described by Lambecius in his catalogue of the Imperial Library at Vienna. On the first folio of this Psalter a set of verses is found, and on these verses Lambecius founded his conclusion that the Psalter belonged to Charlemagne, and that it was presented by him, when King of France, to Pope Hadrian I. when he succeeded to the Papal Chair. We need not give the verses here, but only mention now that Mr. Ffoulkes ('Athanasian Creed,' p. 304) remarks that the words may have been written by any King Charles of France to any Pope Hadrian. The account in Water-

land is so circumstantial as to give a very strong air of credibility to the story, and the very year in which the presentation was made is stated with assurance. But the fixing of the year was, as Lambecius himself states, a pure conjecture of his own. His words are : ' Ipse Carolus Magnus proprio carmine suo testatur se illum Codicem summo Pontifici Hadriano I. dono misisse, et quidem, UT EGO ARBITROR, illo ipso anno DCCLXXII., cujus die decimo Februarii jam memoratus Hadrianus in summum Pontificem electus est.'

We may ask how it came about that this gift was so assuredly ascribed to Charlemagne. Prefixed to this precious volume is a record attested by an Imperial notary ; a copy is given in Lambecius, ' Comment de Biblioth. Caes. Vindobon,' lib. ii., cap. v., p. 295. This record is to the effect that this Psalter had been used by Hildegard, wife of Charlemagne, while she lived (*dum viveret*), and that, in memory of himself and his wife, the Emperor gave it to the church at Bremen, A.D. 788, and that it had been kept there for more than eight centuries. (' Octo integris sæculis et quod excurrit.') Now, Hildegard became Queen in A.D. 722, and lived until A.D. 783. Charlemagne did not become Emperor until A.D. 800, and therefore was not Emperor in A.D. 788, when the Emperor Charles is said in the record, attested, be it observed, by an Imperial notary, to have presented the book which his wife had used during her life. But let us look at the date of this record. It states that the Psalter had been kept at the church at Bremen for more than 800 years. Therefore it could not have been written until after A.D. 1588. What can be the value of such a record? Then we are told, in addition, that (and this professes to be extracted from the ancient records of the church) Charlemagne, seeing the great sanctity of Bishop Willehad, endowed that bishopric largely, and gave to the church certain insignia, among which was included ' Psalterium divæ ipsius conjugis.'

As Willehad became bishop only in A.D. 788, would it not have been a little more discreet on the part of the ' compilers ' of the records to have delayed the gift, giving Charlemagne a little time in which to see the development of Willehad's sanctity? Willehad, it is interesting to note,

was an English priest, born in Northumberland, and was the first missionary who passed the Elbe. He has been called the Apostle of Saxony (see Alban Butler, 'Lives of the Saints,' vol. xi.) The inscription, contemporary with the manuscript, which attests the presentation of the volume to the Pope, is ignored in the entry of the notary ! We fail to see how both accounts can be correct. In our opinion, either one or other, the ascription in the verses or the notary, is wrong. Perhaps neither is true ! The sixteenth century furnishes in various ways sufficient evidence that it was not even necessary for the production of these verses, that either a King of France, by name Charles, or that a Pope of Rome, by name Hadrian, should have lived at all. Is the manufacture of relics, and of records respecting them, a thing altogether unheard of or impossible ? And notwithstanding the opinion of Dr. Swainson, 'that the evidence' that this Psalter 'was prepared either for Pope Hadrian or for Hildegardis, the wife of Charlemagne, and at her death given to the church at Bremen, and there preserved until the epoch of the Reformation, is too strong to be gainsaid,' we doubt whether the Psalter ever belonged to Hildegard at all. But even this bold statement does not indicate that we believe the Psalter to be valueless as regards this Creed. On the contrary, we hold it to be of immense value in determining the question as to the use to which the Creed was put. On this matter we shall treat later on. Daniel, 'On the Prayer-Book,' states, p. 133, as unquestionable that the Athanasian Creed was presented by Charlemagne to the Pope, A.D. 772 ; that it was written in Latin, and first heard of in Gaul ; that it was probably introduced into this country in the 9th century, but not into the Roman offices until about A.D. 930. Our opinion does not at all coincide with the first of these statements ; but, as Dr. Schaff says, 'on this subject all views are mere opinions,' we are entitled to hold one as much as Canon Daniel, or as Waterland was to conjecture as to its age and authorship.

The records of the church at Bremen bear many traces of a modern origin, and the whole of the formal account and record is so full of inconsistencies, that we are quite unable to trust it in any particular. Why should not the

ascription be made to apply to Charles the Bald? There is nothing in the verses to preclude this. 'He came to the throne of France in A.D. 840, and died A.D. 877, having been crowned Emperor A.D. 875, and Pope Hadrian II. occupied the Papal Chair from A.D. 867-872' (Lumby, p. 228). And when we come to inquire about the Creed itself in this Psalter, the account is by no means satisfactory for the early date. Lambecius describes it as being contained in what he calls an Appendix (Lambecius, vol. ii., p. 267). Before the Psalter itself is reached in the volume, it appears from the description that there are some documents which Lambecius calls 'Prolegomena,' and, after speaking of them, he adds: 'Cæterum quamvis tam de hisce prolegomenis quam de ipso præstantissimo illius psalterii aureis literis exarati contextu ejusque lemmatibus et appendice alio commodiori loco in hisce commentariis agere constituerim.'

From this it would seem that Lambecius looked upon the Appendix, not as part of the Psalter, but as a separate work or collection which had been bound up with the Psalter. Again, when commencing to treat of this portion, he writes: 'Sequitur deinde appendix.' This Appendix appears to contain the *Te Deum*, which is here entitled 'Hymnus quem S. Ambrosius et S. Augustinus invicem condiderunt,' also the Apostles' Creed, with the title, 'Symbolum Sanctorum Apostolorum,' and the 'Quicunque' itself is called 'Fides S. Athanasii Episcopi Alexandrini.' Mr. Ffoulkes has pointed out, p. 307, that these titles are not found elsewhere till the ninth century, and are not common even then. It is the opinion of not a few that the 'Quicunque' contained in this Psalter is not of the same age and character as the body of the Psalter itself (Lumby, pp. 204, 205). It is interesting to note that it is included with other hymns in the Appendix. Of this Psalter Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 98, says: 'The earliest extant manuscript Psalter in which the Athanasian Creed occurs, or is known to be extant, is the celebrated and costly Psalter written apparently by command of Charlemagne before he became Emperor, and sometime in the Pontificate of Hadrian I., which lasted from A.D. 772 to 795.'

Referring to the difficulty in reconciling the history of

the Psalter, as attested by the records of the church of Bremen, with the first set of dedicatory verses, Mr. Ommaney says, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 105, 'the difficulty is not insurmountable.' The theory of Lambecius respecting this Psalter is that Charlemagne sent it as a present to Hadrian at Rome on the occasion of his elevation to the Papal throne in the year 772, and that it was in the possession of Hadrian till 788, when that Pope presented it to Willehad upon his consecration as the first Bishop of Bremen. But this is, as Pagi remarked ('Critica in Annales Baronii, An. 783'), entirely unsupported by evidence, 'and it is highly improbable that the Pope should have parted with a present conferred upon him by so great a monarch, and that, too, in order to bestow it upon a subject of that monarch. Pagi therefore conjectures that Hadrian, having originally received it from Charlemagne, afterwards gave it to Hildegardis, when she accompanied the latter to Rome in 781, and that thus it reverted to Charlemagne on her death, which took place two years after. But this is also improbable. The simplest solution of the difficulty appears to be that suggested by the authors of the "*Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*," that the Psalter, though dedicated to the Pope, from some cause or other, was never actually sent to him' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' pp. 105, 106). The Psalter was described by Denis, the Vienna librarian at the close of the eighteenth century, as belonging to the eighth century, and he is very positive about its antiquity. 'The Benedictine authors of the "*Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*," who seem to have been well acquainted with the manuscript, place it at the latter part of the eighth century. And more recently Silvestre and his coadjutors express the same opinion, founded apparently on a personal examination of the book' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' pp. 106, 107). For ourselves the conflicting inscriptions, dedicatory verses, and records of the church of Bremen have no value whatever.

(7) Another manuscript which is in the Royal Library at Paris is fragmentary, and contains only the first eleven verses of the Creed. There are no variations in this document, so that it is most likely as late as the ninth century, if not later.

(8) Yet another copy, perhaps of about the same date, is

found in a Gallican Psalter in the library of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge. The title of this is 'Fides Anastathii Episcopi.' Waterland's date for this manuscript is A.D. 850. The first time that this title 'Fides Anastasii Episcopi' occurs Waterland found to be in a twelfth-century manuscript written for Church use in Augsburg (Waterland, cap. iv.). And in cap. ii. Waterland has in text and note the testimony of Beleth, a celebrated Paris divine, A.D. 1190, that in his time the Creed was commonly ascribed to Anastasius. Beleth, however, did not share in the common opinion. Other manuscripts have 'Fides Anastasii Papæ,' twelfth century; while Simon of Tournay, in the early part of the thirteenth century, gives a circumstantial account of the occasion of its composition by Pope Anastasius. It is undoubtedly a loss most sincerely to be regretted by all searchers after truth that the Trèves manuscript has disappeared. Whence the writer of the original Trèves manuscript, whatever its complete contents, derived his materials it is not difficult to guess. In a very true sense his were the Fathers. The language of the fragment which has been preserved to us indicates plainly in the case of verse 30 that it was in existence before the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. For the clause, 'perfect God and perfect man,' though not occurring in the works of St. Augustine, is found in the 'Commonitorium' of St. Vincent of Lerins, A.D. 434 (Vincent., cap. xix.; Waterland, cap. ix.). But the expression was not even then quite new, for St. Athanasius himself had employed against the Apollinarian heresy (Athanasius, 'Contr. Appollinarium,' i. 16) language almost identical: *Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος* (cf. Hefele's 'Councils,' English edition, vol. iii., pp. 94, 131). Later, it was borrowed by the compilers of the Union Creed of Antioch, which was drawn up by John, Bishop of Antioch, and his friends, with a view to effecting a reconciliation, which it really did a little later. In the Profession of Faith put forth by Theodore of Mopsuestia, the master of Nestorius, and who is often regarded as the real author of Nestorianism, almost the very words of this verse of the Creed occur. In the translation from the Greek, which was made for the use of Westerns by Marius Mercator, the wording is as follows :

‘Hominem natura perfectum, ex anima rationali et humana carne compositum.’ The Confession is quoted by Schaff (‘Church History,’ vol. iii., p. 727). In the Colbertine manuscript verse 35 is wanting, and it has been suggested that the omission may have been caused by the copy having been made during the time that the Adoptionist controversy was raging, or some other reason may have induced the copyist to omit a clause which at the time was the subject of much discussion.

(9) Another Psalter, which was, it is said, unknown to Waterland, is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. It was originally in the library of the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Près. It is known by the sign of ‘Latin 13159.’ It is a Gallican Psalter, and is remarkable for the richness of its ornamentation, and for the great care which was evidently bestowed upon it in the course of its production. It has lost several leaves at the end. It has elaborate initial letters, especially in connection with the first Psalm, and this Psalm occupies one whole page. Its contents are: The Psalms, followed by the apocryphal 151st Psalm; then follow the Old Testament Canticles, but owing to the loss of some leaves—perhaps two—these Canticles are imperfect. The New Testament Canticles follow the *Te Deum*, without a title and incomplete. On folio 161 *recto* the writing begins with part of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Creed being ended, on the other side of the same leaf is found the ‘Quicunque,’ which, like the *Te Deum*, is *without title*. This particular leaf, too, is written by ‘a different hand from almost all the rest of the volume.’ There are Litanies contained in the volume, and occurring in the first is a Prayer for the Pope (Leo), and ‘Carolo excellentissimo es a dō coro . . . atque magno et pacifico regi Francorum et Longobardorum ac patricio Romanorum Vita et victoria.’ Mr. Ommaney considers that this clearly refers to the period when Leo III. was Pope, and before Charlemagne was crowned Emperor (Ommaney, ‘Critical Dissertation,’ pp. 109, 110). This brings it within the period A.D. 795-800. But he allows that Leo IV., who was Pope from 847 to 855, and Charles the Bald were contemporaries, but says the latter was never called, and never was King of the Lombards and Patrician of the Romans. Perhaps not; but is hyperbole

never employed when speaking of royal personages? Has any Sovereign of England ever been described as Ruler (King or Queen) of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, since the days that France recovered her independence of the English? We think that such has been the case. Could not a similar thing have happened in the days of old? The text, too, of the 'Quicunque' in this Psalter varies in only a few instances from the received text. This, in our opinion, is evidence of a later rather than an early date. On the other hand, we are assured by the Director of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, M. de Lisle, that in his opinion the manuscript was written between A.D. 795 and 800. Through the courtesy of this learned librarian we have received a particular description of this manuscript.

(10) Yet another Psalter, called the Psalter of the Emperor Lothair. This is notable as containing a portrait of Lothair, in whose honour it was written, and who is represented with all the surroundings of royal dignity, seated upon a throne, wearing a crown and mantle of cloth of gold studded with jewels, his right hand upon a staff, and his left hand grasping his sword-hilt. Two other portraits are contained in this book—one of David as the inspired author of the Psalms, the other of St. Jerome, who amended the Old Latin Version. The date claimed for this Psalter is A.D. 833. This is, in all probability, the correct date; for, as is known, in A.D. 834 Lothair suffered a complete reverse of fortune. And it is quite unnecessary to proceed any further in the evidence of manuscript, since we are satisfied that at this date—833—the 'Quicunque' had been cast into a crystalline shape, in which it has remained ever since. This Psalter of Lothair is in private hands. Those who wish to read a good and careful description of it will find many particulars in Mr. Ommaney's work 'Critical Dissertation,' pp. 118-122. Two facsimiles of the handwriting, and one of the portrait of Lothair, together with an account of the Codex, may be seen in vol. ii., plates 69, 93, 94, of 'Facsimiles of Manuscripts,' published by the Palæographical Society.

(11) Another manuscript mentioned by Mr. Ommaney ('Critical Dissertation,' pp. 113-117) is described as belonging to the ninth century. The Athanasian Creed, with a

very peculiar and unique reading, is contained in it. Mr. Ommaney contends that it was written not later than the year 816 ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 114). In this he is probably correct. The manuscript comprises a Gallican collection of Canons. Its number is 'Latin 1451.'

(12) Another manuscript, also like the last, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, No. 3848*b*. This manuscript is the one which contains the famous Canon of Autun, which occurs in the first chapter of the Herovall collection of Canons. The Athanasian Creed is found in its incomplete form. It also contains discourses upon the Apostles' Creed, and quotations from several of the Fathers. The 'Quicumque' is ascribed to St. Athanasius. The authorities of the Paris Library ascribe this manuscript to the ninth century.

We have now noticed several important manuscripts, and endeavoured to study them in the light of history. We have seen reason to doubt the accuracy of statements and records concerning some of them, and to controvert the opinions of some writers respecting them. History is, perhaps, ruthless and cruel, but its interests are the interests of truth. And no matter what our pet theories may be, or how devout our wish to trace back to the remotest antiquity forms which we deeply reverence, history records for us facts which often demolish, without the slightest remorse, the fair fabric which we had designed.

CHAPTER XVII.

ANCIENT COMMENTS UPON THE 'QUICUNQUE.'

1. PASSING now to ancient Comments upon this Creed, we again encounter the question of date. Waterland's opinion respecting the Fortunatus Commentary is, as we have seen, utterly untenable. The title is 'Expositio Fidei Catholicæ Fortunati.' This manuscript, be it observed, was written five hundred years after the supposed author's death, and this particular Fortunatus is selected out of all who bore that name during those centuries! Why should it not be ascribed to Amalarius Fortunatus, who died soon after A.D. 840? Even with a late date for its composition this man might have written a Comment upon it. There is no reason *à priori*, so far as we know, why he should not have done so. And besides, passages from the works of Alcuin, A.D. 804, are found in this manuscript attributed to Venantius Fortunatus. There are also several quotations from Isidore, who died A.D. 633, and perhaps one from Fulgentius, who died A.D. 533. It is now said that these quotations are interpolations into the text of the Commentary. Mr. Ommaney, as we have seen, has abandoned the theory of Venantius Fortunatus having been the author of this Commentary.

2. The Oxford manuscript (Bodleian, Junius, 25), already referred to (pp. 161-163), is anonymous and shorter. Dr. Swainson says: 'The most ancient Comment is (I conceive) that which exists among the Junius manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. . . . This manuscript must be a transcript of a very ancient document. Our interest in it is enhanced by noticing that, although at the close it contains the whole of the clauses relating to the Incarnation—*i.e.*,

from 30 to the end—it passes over in silence many of the early verses, and entirely omits to notice clauses 2, 12, 14, 16, 18. The perusal of the manuscript suggests to me that the latter two—16, 18—are a late expansion of 20, and thus 12, 14, 16, 18 are recent additions to the original faith.'

3. The same author, in his work 'On the Formation of the Athanasian Creed,' p. 39, quotes a manuscript of Vienna, believed to be of the twelfth century, but containing materials of a much earlier date. The following form is found in this manuscript, which consists of eight verses, numbered here as they correspond to verses in our version :

(1) 'Quicumque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem. (2) Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatam que servaverit absque dubio in æternum peribit. (3) Fides autem catholica hæc est ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur. (4) Neque confundentes personas neque substantiam separantes. (5) Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti. (6) Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas æqualis Gloria co-æterna Majestas. (24) *Qui* in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres personæ co-æternæ sibi sunt et co-æquales. (26) Quicumque ergo cupit salvus esse et catholicus hæc teneat et credat, et vita vivet.'

The writer proceeds from this, as if he had concluded the Catholic Faith, to lay down rules for the life and practice of the Christian. Prof. Lumby, p. 232, quotes him as proceeding: 'Sed tamen post hæc si ad cœleste regnum desiderat pervenire et æterna bona concupiscere contra diaboli insidias quotidie necesse et certare,' etc.

The late Bishop Thirlwall, as Prof. Lumby has pointed out, was the first to suggest that the above probably represented the whole of the original document, and that the verses 7-19 are mere amplifications of the statements made in previous verses ; and it is worthy of notice that, 'in this copy from the Vienna manuscript, as well as in the quotations of Hincmar, Alcuin, Agobard, and other writers, not a trace of these particular verses (7-19) is to be found.' We can scarcely go as far as this, for if they are not to be found in the writers specified, they at least appear to a consider-

able extent in the writings of St. Augustine. And Mr. Ommaney pointed out in his 'Early History of the Athanasian Creed,' p. 231, that 'of the six propositions, each containing a double affirmation, which they include, the three last are to be found almost word for word in his works (St. Augustine's), and the others are there in substance' (cf. 'De Trinitate,' lib. v., cap. viii., sec. 9; also lib. viii., cap. i.; see also Sources of the Quicunque, pp. 206-214 of this volume).

4. The same peculiarity of the omission of the verses noted above is found in the Confession of Denebert, who became Bishop of Worcester A.D. 798. When entering upon his episcopate he put forth, according to the custom of those times, a confession of his faith. He utilized an already existing document, for he says 'Scriptum Est,' and this document turns out to be part of our 'Quicunque'; but he altogether omits verses 7-19; verse 2 is also wanting, and he ends his quotation with verse 25. If he had possessed the 'Quicunque' in its complete form, would he have been likely to have quoted in this manner? We think not. After the quotation from the 'Quicunque,' Bishop Denebert proceeds to speak of the Decrees of the Popes, which he undertakes to observe. It is worthy of notice that in neither of these documents—the Vienna manuscript or Bishop Denebert's Confession—does the reduplication of the Monitory clauses occur, nor do they occur at all, except that clause 2 is found in the Vienna manuscript. Denebert's Confession can be seen in Haddan and Stubbs' 'Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents,' vol. iii., p. 525.

5. The next Commentary noticed by Waterland is that of Bruno, Bishop of Wurzburg, A.D. 1033. This Commentary, says Waterland ('Critical History,' cap. iii.), is much larger than Fortunatus's. It is found at the end of Bruno's Psalter. There are some ten manuscripts reckoned up as being copies of this Commentary which were in existence when Waterland wrote. More recent investigation goes to prove, however, that in this respect Waterland was mistaken, and that most of the manuscripts reckoned as copies of Bruno are in reality copies of another Commentary known now as the 'Stavelot' Commentary. Waterland, indeed, noticed that there were many variations and differ-

ences in reading between the manuscripts enumerated by him as being copies of Bruno, and if the more recent conclusions are to be trusted, there is small room for wonder that Waterland was perplexed at their various readings.

That the conclusions arrived at after careful investigation are sound there can be but little doubt, and Mr. Ommaney is most probably correct when he says that, 'of the ten manuscripts mentioned by Waterland, two only are really copies of Bruno, and of these one has long since perished, or nearly so' ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 231).

The grounds upon which Bruno's authorship has been rejected are too numerous to give in detail here. They may be seen stated at large in cap. iv. of Mr. Ommaney's 'Critical Dissertation.' Of Bruno our author says, p. 207: 'He was not an original writer, but a compiler and manipulator of earlier materials. What he did in this instance is in exact accordance with the system which he followed in the construction of the other Commentaries contained in this Psalter. His Commentaries on the Psalms and the Canticles are compilations of notes gathered from the Fathers, and those on the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed, in the form of question and answer, are borrowed word for word from the eleventh and twelfth chapters of a work entitled "*Disputatio Puerorum*," which is placed by Frobenius among the doubtful works of Alcuin.' So that even the Commentary which is found in Bruno's Psalter itself is not an original work, but a compilation from writers anterior to himself.

6. But with regard to the manuscripts wrongly believed by Waterland to be copies of Bruno, but which are now said to be copies of another Commentary, known as the 'Stavelot.' There are, it would appear, a goodly number of manuscripts of this Commentary still to be found. The British Museum; the Bodleian Library; Trinity College, Cambridge; Balliol, Oxford; St. John's College, Oxford, all have copies; it is also said that one exists in the Cathedral Library at York, and, if memory serves us aright, there is one also in the Library of Durham Cathedral. The diversities between the copy of the real Bruno manuscript and those manuscripts of the 'Stavelot' Commentary are, we are told, notable and numerous, and, in fact, an exami-

nation and comparison of the two need be little more than cursory to verify this statement. Bruno's work may be seen printed in Migne's '*Patrologia Latina*,' tome 142.

The following particulars respecting the manuscript mentioned on p. 176 as being contained in the Cathedral Library at York will be interesting. Its title in the catalogue is: '*Liber Psalmorum cum Glossa: item Oratio Esaiæ, Anna, Habbacuci: et Symb. Athanasii.*' The catalogue adds: '*MS. in memb., fol. xvi., I., 4*'; then by a late hand—for the catalogue is in manuscript—thirteenth century, imp. at beginning. A pencil inscription at the beginning runs: '*Thys boce*' [this word is so written that it might be *voll*, or *book*, or *roll*] '*belongyth to Byland Abbey.*'

But, since the ascription to Bruno fails, to whom can this other Commentary be ascribed? It has recently been ascribed by Mr. Ommaney ('*Critical Dissertation*,' pp. 210, 211) to Theodulph, Abbot of Fleury, and Bishop of Orleans. It is true that Theodulph is credited with having written an exposition of the Athanasian Creed. Baluze ('*Miscellan.*,' lib. i.) says: '*Hic itaque, cum, ut diximus, eruditione præcipuus doctrinaque haberetur, explanationem edidit Symboli Athanasii.*' But whether the reference is to the '*Symbol*' with which St. Athanasius had so much to do at the Nicene Council or to the '*Quicunque*' we are not able to determine. And the grounds of our author's ascription of this Commentary to Theodulph do not appear to us particularly strong. '*Our Commentary has never yet been identified with this work*' (Theodulph's); '*indeed, as I have already said, it has been hitherto confounded with the Commentary of Bruno; but, considering that it was certainly in existence some time before, and may very probably be assigned to the early part of the ninth century, I venture to think that it may also with great probability be regarded as none other than the exposition drawn up by Theodulph*' ('*Critical Dissertation*,' p. 211).

The desire to discover the true parentage of any offspring is a laudable and praiseworthy one, but in this case the grounds given appear to us of insufficient strength to warrant the ascription to Theodulph. There is a strong verbal resemblance between the '*De Fide Trinitatis*' of

Alcuin and the Commentary now under consideration. It seems probable that whoever was the author of the Commentary must have been well acquainted with Alcuin's work.

With the object of proving an early date for the composition of the 'Quicunque,' Mr. Ommaney brings forward four Commentaries in particular, to which he attaches great importance, and they are, both in his former and in his recent work, the subject of considerable notice. They are Commentaries upon our Creed, and are known as the 'Troyes,' the 'Oratorian,' the 'Paris,' and the 'Bouhier,' respectively. Two of these—the 'Troyes' and the 'Oratorian'—are contained in one Codex, No. 804 of the Troyes Public Library. The catalogue of the Troyes Library describes this Codex as written in the ninth century; and we see no reason to impugn the judgment of the compiler of the catalogue, nor do we see why the Commentary must of necessity have been composed not later than the eighth century. Yet Mr. Ommaney contends for this as the date of its composition. To us it is no cause for wonder that a composition like the 'Quicunque' was the subject of much discussion and of written comment upon its introduction to the theologians of the ninth century. It was the kind of document for which many of them had been anxiously looking, and to which they gave a warm and hearty welcome. The 'Bouhier' Commentary is also in the Troyes Public Library, where there are two manuscripts of it, numbered 1979 and 1532 respectively, while a copy of 1532 is in the British Museum, No. 24, 902. The Paris Commentary is contained in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, Latin, No. 1012.

7. The earliest manuscript containing the 'Bouhier' is of the tenth century, and the date of the composition of the Commentary is supposed by Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 196, to be between A.D. 710 and A.D. 750. The chief ground for selecting this date appears to be, that the Commentary contains a passage relating to Monotheism, and that it was composed 'before the memory of the controversy relating to the heresy had died away.' This 'Bouhier' Commentary is contrasted with the 'Oratorian,' and the latter is assumed to be the older of the two.

We confess that the reason which is given seems to us to tell exactly the other way. It is said that the 'Bouhier' reproduces a great part of the 'Oratorian,' 'in an abbreviated and condensed form.' The longer form, then, because of its fulness, is considered to be the older. It is not always and in all cases considered a safe Canon that the shorter and more condensed form of a manuscript is a certain warrant for believing it to be of later date than the fuller text. Another reason for bringing forward this 'Bouhier' Commentary appears to be that it quotes language drawn from the Definition of the Sixth General Council, and on this ground we are asked to believe that the Commentary was drawn up soon after the date of that Council! It does not appear to us at all strange that the language of any Council should be quoted by subsequent writers. Would not this give weight to, and tend to secure acceptance for their productions? But there is another point to be noticed. One manuscript of this Commentary, we are told, attributes it to St. Augustine. On this Professor Lumby, pp. 261, 262, remarks: 'Now, the ascription to St. Augustine either means that the person who affixed it knew that the language of the Commentary was largely drawn, as it is, from the writings of that Father, or it betrays the ignorance of him who gave the title to a document containing a definition which was only formulated at the close of the seventh century.' But again: this 'Bouhier' Commentary, as well as the 'Oratorian,' contains language relating to Monotheletism. It is also admitted that language relating to the same heresy is found in the writings of Paulinus. This Commentary may therefore be of a date as late as Paulinus! The whole Creed is contained in it, and is quoted verse by verse. Reverting to the quotation from the Definition of the Sixth General Council, it is quite obvious to us why a part of this definition is quoted in a document which ascribes the authorship of the Creed to St. Athanasius. For in that definition occur these words: '*For, according to the most wise Athanasius, it was needful that His flesh should be moved, but that it should be subjected to this Divine Will*' (Routh, 'Script. Eccles.,' Opuscula ii., p. 241).

8. The 'Oratorian' Commentary, as it is called, next

claims our attention, and particularly because of the close relation which is said to exist between this and the one previously noted. The relationship is said to be that the language of the 'Bouhier' is a reproduction 'in an abbreviated and condensed form' of the 'Oratorian.' An earlier date is claimed for this 'Oratorian' Commentary, and, it would seem, mainly upon the ground that it adopts the very language of the Sixth General Council for repudiating the Monothelite heresy. The date claimed for it is between A.D. 681, when the Sixth General Council was held, and the close of the Monothelite controversy at the end of the seventh or the commencement of the eighth century. What there was to prevent a writer in the ninth century from quoting the Definition of A.D. 681 we fail to see. And the 'Oratorian' is the fuller form, and therefore, in our opinion, likely to be subsequent to the 'Bouhier,' which has the shorter form.

This 'Oratorian' Commentary is contained, as has been said above, in Codex 804, Troyes Public Library. But although there is so strong a relationship between it and the 'Bouhier,' they are contained in different volumes. The 'Oratorian' is professedly a compilation from other sources, both in matter and in language. And there is a close verbal correspondence in some passages between this work and the work of Alcuin on the Faith of the Holy Trinity. Of course, it may be said, as, indeed, it has been said, that this correspondence is due to both writers having drawn from one source. This one source, it is implied, is St. Augustine. For it is contended that 'Alcuin was not an original writer, and borrowed largely from his predecessors, especially St. Augustine; and in no case is there any reason for supposing that the commentator drew from him directly' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 189). On comparing Alcuin's 'De Fide Trinitatis' with the 'Liber de Fide ad Petrum,' which is *ascribed* to Fulgentius, there is a very close correspondence, and it is further to be observed that the Milan Codex, which claims Venantius Fortunatus for its author, has most certainly borrowed from Alcuin—unless, indeed, it can be shown (as who can tell whether it may not?) that Alcuin based his work, or part of it, on the Fortunatus model. But what if the close correspondence between the

work of Alcuin and the Milan Codex be due to interpolations of a later date drawn from the writings of Alcuin? This is, indeed, the course adopted. But a reversal of the Canon is adopted now. The 'Bouhier' was said to be *later* because of its greater brevity; but in the manuscripts brought forward to prove that the quotations from Alcuin which are contained in the Milan Codex are interpolations, we are told that the *shorter* copies are to be accepted as the *more ancient* (Ommaney, 'Early History of Athanasian Creed,' quoted by Lumby, p. 266).

There is a duplicate of this 'Oratorian' Commentary in the Vatican Library, a tenth-century manuscript, probably, although it has been stated by Professor Jones of St. Beuno's College, 'that in the opinion of Professor Bollig that portion of the manuscript which contains this Commentary was written in the beginning of the eleventh or in the tenth century' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 190). It is evident, therefore, that the tenth century is the earliest date to which this Commentary can lay claim. It appears to contain a Preface, the contents of which give our Author grounds for believing that the Commentary is of an early date. He notes, for instance (p. 195), that 'it speaks of the Athanasian Creed as being at the time recited in churches here and there only—in some places and dioceses, not in others.' Quite so; it is exactly our contention, that during the ninth century the 'Quicunque' won its way into fairly general use. It is, we believe, a generally accepted fact, that it was not adopted in the Roman Service till A.D. 930 (Barry, 'Teachers' Prayer-Book;' Evan Daniel, 'On the Prayer-Book,' p. 133). If it was not adopted at Rome till 930, there is little cause for wonder that a tenth-century Commentator noticed the fact that its use had not yet become universal. Such a custom took time to get established.

9. The third of these Commentaries, known as the 'Troyes,' is contained, as we have already said, in Codex No. 804 of the Troyes Public Library. It is described by Mr. Ommaney ('Critical Dissertation,' p. 184) as a 'thick quarto volume of 243 leaves, written, according to the printed catalogue, in the ninth or tenth century, but in the opinion of the present Librarian in the latter; comprising twenty-four documents

in all, among which, besides works of St. Augustine, Fulgentius, Theodulph, are the Confessions of Faith commonly described as 'Fides Hieronymi,' two expositions of the Lord's Prayer, the first being the work of St. Augustine, three expositions of the Apostles' Creed, and of these also the first is by St. Augustine, and two of the "Quicumque." The title of the Commentary in this 'Troyes document' is 'Expositio fidei Catholicæ.' It is admitted by Mr. Ommaney, p. 185, that this 'Troyes' Commentary had for one of its sources the Commentary of Venantius Fortunatus, so called. He says: 'In the earlier portion the connection is close and obvious, sometimes literal, and this is the case particularly at the commencement. In the latter part, relating to the Incarnation, this is not so obvious; still, a similarity of thought is traceable, and here and there the language of the earlier Commentary crops up in the latter.'

It is claimed that this Commentary is a work of the eighth century. It is allowed that this 'Troyes' Commentary is earlier than either the 'Bouhier' or the 'Oratorian,' and this would seem to be obvious, since the form of the 'Quicumque' is in this 'Troyes' document an imperfect one. The Creed is not quoted here verse by verse. And since the Fortunatus document at Milan is of so uncertain a date, even if it be allowed that quotations from Isidore, Alcuin and Fulgentius are interpolations of a later date, the whole value of the 'Troyes' document fails, seeing that it in its turn depended upon the Fortunatus Commentary for its materials. And our author makes an admission on pp. 187, 188, which does not, in our opinion, help the case for an early date for this 'Troyes' Commentary. He says: 'The attention of Western theologians was directed to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, contemporaneously with Adoptionism in the latter half of the eighth century and the beginning of the ninth. In our document the doctrine is stated more than once, as held and taught by the Western Church, but it is only stated incidentally and naturally, not dwelt nor enlarged upon nor made the subject of argument or comment or of reference to authorities, as would be the case in a time of controversy upon the subject; no appeal is made in reference to it, as there is in reference to the two wills, divine and human, of our Lord.'

The reason of this we believe to be that the Commentary was not compiled until the controversy had become almost a thing of the past, and the doctrine of the Procession had become firmly established in the Western Church.

10. The fourth of these Commentaries, known as the 'Paris,' is, as we have said, in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, No. 1,012. The old catalogue of this library assigns this manuscript to the ninth century, but the present learned Director of the library, Monsieur De Lisle, is of opinion that it belongs to the early part of the tenth century. The Commentary is only one among other documents contained in the Codex. The 'Quicunque' is quoted verse by verse, and the Commentary is, when compared with the 'Oratorian' and 'Troyes' Commentaries, found to be of a more simple and elementary character. 'And this greater simplicity may be naturally regarded as an indication of greater antiquity' (Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 199). It includes a passage from the writings of Gregory the Great, who died A.D. 604. It cannot, therefore, be claimed for this that it was composed before the seventh century. 'Still,' says Mr. Ommaney, p. 200, 'many of the notes which it contains may have existed at an earlier date.' And, again, 'It is impossible to suppose that the Commentary was compiled later than the latter part of the ninth century' (p. 200). We fail to see why this Commentary is brought forward to assist in proving an early date for the composition of our document. We can only suppose that it is the desire to place all the available evidence before his readers that has induced our author to lay so much stress upon this 'Paris' Commentary. To us there is nothing surprising in the fact that a ninth or tenth century compilation contains quotations from eminent writers of any of the preceding centuries, and the compiler doubtless realized what an advantage it would give his work to include within it a quotation from the works of so eminent a man as Gregory the Great was.

We wonder more and more why it is that the advocates of an early date for the composition of the 'Quicunque' will insist upon its having been composed as one complete document, and will not allow that it grew by degrees and stages to its present form. Elaborate Creeds are not born in a day; they take time to develop. And why should not

this formula have been a development, as the other Confessions were? All the landmarks of its history which we possess seem to point to the fact that its growth was gradual, and we need scarcely look for proof of its composition in its present complete and perfect state at any one definite point of history.

The words of Bishop Barry, 'Teachers' Prayer-Book,' p. 49, appear to us to be sober and reasonable. He says: 'It is possible that it may have been gradually elaborated up to its present complete form, and, therefore, may not be absolutely traceable to any single authorship. Both these points (date and authorship), however, which are as yet quite undecided, are of high critical interest rather than of practical importance. The Creed has at any rate a prescription in its favour of the use of 1,000 years in the Western Church generally, and of use in the vernacular in the Church of England for more than 300 years. Its authority as a Rule of Faith depends simply on its accordance with Scriptural truth. Its fitness for Liturgical use on its intelligibility to the people, and its power of edification.' And the same author, on p. 48 of the same work, says: 'It probably originated in Spain or Gaul, towards the close of the long conflict against the deep-rooted Arianism of the Gothic races.'

CHAPTER XVIII.

COUNCILS : CANONS AND ECCLESIASTICAL INJUNCTIONS.

PASSING from the subject of Commentaries, what do we find at the end of the eighth century to indicate the existence and use of *our* 'Quicunque'? If Mr. Ommaney's contention and his opinion, and the opinion of those who agree with him respecting the date of this composition, be the right one, we ought to find at the end of the eighth century the 'Quicunque' in universal use. If this were the case, would not men like Alcuin, Paulinus, and Charlemagne have made some mention of it? Yet no word escapes from them indicating that they had any knowledge of such a composition. We see Charlemagne at the very zenith of his power and influence; Alcuin in the prime of his intellect, and active in all matters ecclesiastical; Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, making on behalf of himself, on behalf of Holy Church, and on behalf of his royal master, most diligent search for anything and everything that could in any way add grandeur and dignity to that great and powerful empire, in which the interests of Church and State were identical. But there is no 'Quicunque.' The Processionist and Adoptionist controversies were raging, and our document could have been employed by the orthodox had they possessed it. And it is difficult to understand how a document, which, according to Mr. Ommaney and those who agree with him, had at that time attained to a great degree of antiquity, could have escaped the vigilant search of Paulinus and Charlemagne.

The activity of Charlemagne in all matters ecclesiastical is proverbial, and he set himself to improve in every way he could the dominions under his rule. To scholars and

learning he was especially attentive. Paulinus, too, was a man of far-reaching influence and power. His name, wherever known, was venerated, both on account of his years and also on account of the grave dignity of his character and individuality. Alcuin, who was an Englishman, and deacon of the Church of York, was sent, in 790, by Offa, King of the Mercians, as ambassador to the King of France. Here he became a great favourite, and threw himself with vigour into all the ecclesiastical schemes of both Charlemagne and Paulinus. For the latter Alcuin appears to have entertained the most profound regard, and even the royal master appears to have regarded Paulinus with something akin to awe. Alcuin was one of the most learned men of his time, and his work on the doctrine of the Trinity proves him to have been master of his subject. Yet Alcuin does not appear to have known of the 'Quicunque,' or surely, in the controversy, in which he took part, and at the Council where Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, and Felix of Urgella, were condemned for opinions very like Nestorianism, he would have made good use of it. The Council referred to just above was that of Frankfort, which met A.D. 794.

The bishops of Italy put forth a 'libellus,' which was either written by or under the guidance of Paulinus himself (Lumby, 'History of the Creeds,' p. 236). But the 'Quicunque' itself was certainly not known to the author or authors of the 'libellus,' for the clauses, with one exception, which most nearly approach the language of the 'Quicunque' are at best only a very rough approximation to those which they may be supposed to represent. The Bishops of Gaul and Germany addressed a letter to the presidents of the Spanish churches, after the condemnation of the error of the two Spaniards referred to above. And it is plain from their letter that some exposition of the belief of the whole Church was being aimed at (Lumby, p. 238). For they say: 'Likewise in the dogma of the Catholic Faith it is said, Therefore the Son of God became the Son of man, being born in the truth of nature from God as Son of God, and in the truth of nature from man as Son of man, so that the Verity of the Only-begotten might have the name of Son not by adoption or title merely, but in the

case of each nativity by being born, so that He might be very God and very Man, one Son.' (For the text, see Mansi, xiii. 894).

But more may be added. About the same time Charlemagne was writing a letter to the bishops of Spain. He relates how he has sent hither and thither to gather the opinions of many on the points in debate. He encloses documents, showing the opinions so collected, and adds to them the expression of his own agreement with them. But there is no 'Quicunque.' The Constantinopolitan Creed to the end of the Article on the Holy Ghost is quoted, and then follows a fairly long dissertation on the Catholic Faith. (For the text, see Mansi, xiii. 905.) The clauses which are most like the 'Quicunque' will be found quoted in the chapter on the Sources of the 'Quicunque.' Is it not in the highest degree probable that if Charlemagne had known of the 'Quicunque' he would have used it in writing to these bishops of Spain? But to go one step further: in 796 the Council of Forum Julii was assembled, of which Paulinus was not only the convener, but, as Professor Lumby has well said, he was also the 'President and soul as well' (Lumby, p. 235). The object of the Council was the discussion of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. Now, these are the very doctrines with which the 'Quicunque' deals, and it is not possible to believe that this composition was known to Paulinus, or he would surely have quoted it and recommended it to the Council, as being exactly what was at that time needed. That the need of some such Commentary was felt is plain from his own words. He says that his first idea is to set forth 'the very text of the Creed.' Afterwards he proceeds: 'For I know that in the records of some synods it is laid down that no one may lawfully teach or frame another Symbol of the Faith. Far be it from us, and far from every faithful heart, to frame or teach another Symbol or Faith, or in another manner than they' (he means the Holy Fathers of the Great Councils) 'appointed. But according to their meaning we have decreed to deliver in exposition those matters which haply, on account of the brief statement of the truth, are less understood by the simple and unlearned than they ought to be.' (See Migne, xcix. 286, 293 for text.) The Symbol

is too compendious, and for the sake of those who are too simple or not learned enough to understand it, an explanatory treatise is to be put forth, but which is not to depart, in its meaning, from the authoritative pronouncements of the Fathers who promulgated the Creed.

Within fifty years of this date the 'Quicunque' was not only known, but used, and looked upon as a most satisfactory exposition of the doctrines in debate at Friuli (Lumby, p. 244). The passages most nearly approximating to clauses in the 'Quicunque' will be found quoted in another place. We may quote here Professor Lumby's comment upon the address of Paulinus. He says (p. 251): 'This address is noteworthy on several accounts. It is an endeavour to supply an urgent want, and one for which no other supply was apparent to the author. And following after the exposition of the faith set forth by the same prelate at the previous synod of Frankfort, it shows how expositions on the Catholic Faith were being modelled after this manner. It contains, so to speak, the lines on which the "Quicunque" is fashioned. Here are many of the propositions of that Creed, though nearly all couched in different words, and here is the fashion of that amplification which was noticed by the late Bishop of St. David's. Many attributes and qualities are predicated of the Father, then a repetition of the same and their predication of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Not, indeed, in the detached way in which each separate predication is dealt with in the "Quicunque," but yet evidently a step in the direction of that greater elaboration and distinctness. Nor does the language of Paulinus seem to imply that his own exposition was regarded by him as final. "Exponendum decrevimus tradere" are words which may well mean that he would be glad to welcome other expositors who should be willing to enter on such a task. They certainly intimate that no satisfactory treatise was in existence within the range of Paulinus' observation.'

After this, the *first* part of the Creed is undoubtedly alluded to by writers like Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, and the Monks of Mount Olivet. But even as late as A.D. 813 it would seem that the two parts of the 'Quicunque' had not been welded together. For in that year, by order of Charlemagne, a Council was assembled at Arles, at which the doc-

trines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, which were still subjects of ecclesiastical controversy, were discussed. Now, of all places where the 'Quicunque' would be known, if it were in existence, Arles surely, according to Waterland's theory, would be the most likely. For if its former bishop had composed so notable a document, it is hard to believe that the record of it could have altogether perished by A.D. 813. Yet there is no reference in the documents and Canons of that Council to any such treatise as being known. A rough approximation to the clauses of our 'Quicunque' is certainly to be found in Canon I., as may be seen in Mansi, xiv. 58, Canon I. And if it had been known to Charlemagne at this time, it is impossible to believe that he would not have transmitted it to this Council of his own summoning. Professor Lumby says (p. 256): 'It was, then, because it was unknown to him that no notice is taken of it in the proceedings at Arles. In that case it may be almost certainly concluded that it had not been compiled, and that the monks possessed merely the portion which was for a long time the best known, and from which their argument is drawn. The name of Athanasius was attached, if this be so, to the first section of the Creed, before the combination of the two documents into one.' We may suppose that during the next twenty-five years this combination took place, and that the completed document underwent revision and amplification, to emerge by about the middle of the ninth century in the form in which it has been known ever since *circa* A.D. 850.

This chapter would scarcely be complete without some reference to the Canons and ecclesiastical injunctions which are brought forward with so much confidence by Mr. Ommaney in support of his theory that the 'Quicunque' was composed before the middle of the fifth century. The first document which he quotes in this connection is known as the 'Epistola Canonica,' which was assigned by the Ballerini to the early part of the sixth century. In it mention is made of some composition under the name of 'Fides Catholica.' This we believe to be the authorized and accepted Confession of Faith adopted at the Nicene Council, together with such additions as had been admitted at various times subsequently. In a word, we believe

'Fides Catholica' to refer to the body of doctrine received by the Church everywhere, the Catholic Faith. But the Ballerini, and our author following them, and relying upon their opinion, believe that it refers to the 'Quicunque.' But surely there is but little ground for such a belief? For, even supposing that Vincent did compose our document in A.D. 434, would it in so short a time have become so well known as to be described by a bishop in his charge, in a northern diocese of Italy, in the early part of the sixth century, as 'Fides Catholica'? We think not. We are told, moreover, that the 'Epistola Canonica' is an Italian document, whereas the birthplace of the 'Quicunque' was certainly Gaul. But again, no document of the nature of our 'Quicunque' could have obtained such a place in the official documents of the Church as to be described as 'Fides Catholica' without having been subjected to a close scrutiny and a rigorous criticism by the Churchmen of that age. Yet we look in vain for even the slightest hint of such discussion. And again, we are told by Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 392, and it is quite true, that in the oldest manuscripts which contain the 'Quicunque' it is without title. Yet it is claimed that in this, the oldest document brought forward in advocacy of an early date, the name 'Fides Catholica' must refer to our composition!

The external evidence for the antiquity and authenticity of this document appear to us to be of still less value. It is, we are told, quoted by Atto, who was Bishop of Vercellæ A.D. 945-960. We fail to see anything remarkable in the fact of Atto, in the tenth century, quoting from a document composed either in the sixth or any other previous century. It is nothing to the point to say that even in the tenth century its age was not known. Lost in a hoar antiquity! The real question is, To what does 'Fides Catholica' refer? Most certainly not to the 'Quicunque.' The 'Epistola Canonica' is printed in the appendix to the works of St. Leo (Migne, 'Patrol. Latina,' tom. lvi., p. 890; also in Baluzii, 'Capitularia,' tom. ii., p. 1374).

The Canon of Autun, which is the next one referred to by Mr. Ommaney, has been already discussed. It was not a nail fastened in a sure place, even to Waterland; it has not proved more reliable since his time.

The next document brought forward by Mr. Ommaney is a Capitulare or Episcopal charge, addressed by Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans, to the presbyters of his diocese, of which the first injunction is as follows: 'Therefore we admonish you, O priests of the Lord, that you both commit to memory and thoroughly understand the Catholic Faith;' that is, 'I believe,' and, 'Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.' This Capitulare must have been issued somewhere between A.D. 794 and A.D. 821. Theodulph died in the latter year. We know no reason why such an injunction could not have been made at that time. Possibly enough it was not issued until near A.D. 820, at which time the 'Quicunque' was probably in existence almost in the same words as we now possess it. The Capitulare can be seen in Migne, 'Patrol. Latina,' tom. cv., p. 209.

The last of these Canons and Injunctions which we propose to notice is that brought forward by Mr. Ommaney from the Council of Frankfort, which was held in A.D. 794. It is brought forward to prove that the 'Quicunque' was known to, and used by, the bishops and clergy in the days of Charlemagne. We have shown just above that such could not have been the case. The thirty-third Capitulum of that Council runs: 'Ut fides Catholica sancta Trinitatis et oratio dominica atque symbolum fidei omnibus prædicetur et tradatur.'

Vossius thought that 'Fides Catholica' referred to the Nicene Creed. That Creed contains the Faith of the Church with respect to the Holy Trinity. The 'Symbolum Fidei' was a common name for the Apostles' Creed. Waterland was of opinion that 'Fides Catholica' referred to the Athanasian Creed. Mr. Ommaney is of the same opinion. But this title of 'Fides Catholica' was by no means exclusively employed to designate the 'Quicunque.' To quote only one instance as proof of this, Amalarius, the deacon of Metz, who died *circa* A.D. 843, says, 'De. Eccl. Officiis,' iv. 2: 'After the Lord's Prayer there follows our belief which the holy Apostles drew up, concerning the faith of the Holy Trinity, and the dispensation of our Lord's Incarnation, and the state of our Church.' Such was his designation of the Apostles' Creed. He was not singular; there were

many others who, like him, considered that the 'Fides Catholica' was contained in the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.

The strange theories of Professors Swainson and Lumby, and of those who agree with them, to which Mr. Ommaney takes exception, have at least one merit, they do not wish to claim for this excellent production a greater antiquity than it can be really proved to have a title to. The questions which we are bound to ask of Mr. Ommaney and those who agree with him are of the following nature: Supposing the 'Quicumque' to have been composed in the fifth century, how is it that it is not found in any of the works of any of the writers of that century, or in any of the records of any of the Councils held in the same period? If it was composed by Vincentius, surely he need not have published it anonymously? How is it that such an important composition, if it be really his, is not found among his works? And how has it happened that his name is not attached to at least some of the manuscripts which contain it? The acts and proceedings of the Councils of Toledo, A.D. 589-638, have phrases and clauses which are now contained in our 'Quicumque.' Surely if it had been at that time a document of antiquity, those who composed those Councils must have known of it; this is proved by their language; and they would certainly have recited and embodied it as a whole in their Acts. There were precedents for such a course of action. Cyril's second Epistle to Nestorius, and Leo's Epistle to Flavian; these were read, approved, and adopted by General Councils. And if it were composed in the fifth century, where was it hidden, and where the place of its concealment until in the early part of the ninth century it came to the knowledge of men, and at once took a place in the Offices of the Church?

CHAPTER XIX.

WHAT WAS THE ORIGINAL PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE
'QUICUNQUE' WAS COMPOSED?

THAT it was not originally intended for use as a Symbol such as the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds were is certain and plain to even the most casual inquirer: it differs so entirely from the Confessions of Faith, and is, it is clear, rather an Exposition of the Faith. 'The reception of the "Quicunque,"' says Professor Lumby, p. 276, 'was at first and for a considerable period only as an exposition of the doctrines of the lesser Creed, and for the use of the Clergy, not as a profession of faith put into the mouths of the whole congregation.'

Bishop Hatto, Hincmar, and Ratherius, all commend to the clergy for their use 'The Faith of Athanasius,' or Athanasius's 'Treatise upon Faith.' Hatto confines the study of it to the Sacerdotes; while Hincmar and Ratherius order it for *Unusquisque presbyterorum*. And it may be added that in Regino's 'Collection of Canons' there is one which requires that each presbyter should insist on his parishioners being able to 'repeat from memory the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, since without a knowledge of these *nullus salvus esse poterit*' (Regino, book i., cclxxv.). We are entitled, we think, to infer from this, that the 'Quicunque' was not then considered necessary to be either known or accepted as part of the faith by the laity, but was restricted to the clergy for use in instructing their flocks.

'That this was the intention of that composition of which the Trèves manuscript formed part, is evident from the language of the fragment preserved to us. "According to

our faith Christ suffered" is its expression, and "Fides" meant the Creed when this was written. And, again, He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, as has been delivered to you in the Symbol, where we see that this fragment contains part of an address delivered on the solemn occasion of the "Traditio Symboli." Professor Swainson also: 'The references to another Creed, another faith, are marked and decisive: "qui secundum fidem nostram passus, ad dexteram Dei patris sedet sicut vobis in symbolo traditum est." The word "vobis" at once informs us that the mutilated original of this Colbertine copy was an address to some persons or other under instruction; the "credimus et speramus" exhibits an avowal of belief and hope on the part of the teacher; the last few lines therefore appear as little else than an expansion of a portion of the *Symbolum quod tradebatur*, and the clause *ad inferna descendens* at once carries us away from any conception that the Nicene Symbol was that which was being expounded; whilst it is equally clear that the words *Hæc est fides sancta et catholica* sum up and enforce the *doctrina* of the teacher, but are no portions of that *doctrina* itself.'

Evidence of its use in this way is also to be found in the modern Roman Ritual, in which in the Service for the Baptism of Adults the first two clauses of the Catholic Faith of the Athanasian Creed occur between the Interrogations: 'Fides autem est ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate venereris, neque confundendo personas neque substantiam separando: alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti; sed horum trium una est substantia et non nisi una divinitas.' From these quotations it is clear that this Creed was originally one of the many expositions of the baptismal Symbol which were current in the Church. Waterland, we may remark here, was mainly influenced in assigning the authorship of the composition to Hilary by the fact that Honoratus relates of him that Hilary 'composed an admirable exposition of the Creed' (Waterland, cap. viii.). 'He calls it,' says Waterland, 'an exposition of the Creed (not a Creed), which is the proper title for it, and more proper than that of Symbolum or Creed, which it now bears. And so we find that it was but very rarely called Symbolum by the ancients—once I think,

by Hincmar, and never after for several centuries; and when it was, yet it was observed by Thomas Aquinas that that was not so proper a name for it, not being composed *per modum Symboli*—in the way of a Creed.' And Mr. Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 398, says: 'Waterland, following Sirmond, asserts that the Athanasian Creed is called *Symbolum* by Hincmar. But the document quoted by Hincmar in his work "*De Prædestinatione*," which he attributes to Athanasius and describes as *Symbolum*, is clearly not our Creed, but a Profession of Faith, called "*Fides Romanorum*" and "*Fides Romanæ Ecclesiæ*," which has been very absurdly printed by Chifflet as the ninth book of Vigilius, "*De Trinitate*." It is possible that Hincmar may have confounded the "*Fides Romanorum*" with the Athanasian Creed; but this is not probable, considering that he was thoroughly familiar with the latter, as appears from the frequent quotations from it, and applications of its language which he has made in his treatise "*De una et non trina Deitate*.'"

And on the previous page, 397, our author says: 'The term *Symbolum*, as far as we know, was first applied to the "*Quicunque*" in the latter part of the twelfth century. It was thus used by Henry, Abbot of Brunswick, and John Beleth at that epoch. Afterwards it grew into common use, particularly in the title "*Symbolum Athanasii*" and the like, which appears in Breviaries.' The Sarum Breviary had '*Symbolum Athanasii*,' in the Benedictine and Roman Breviaries it is headed '*Symbolum S. Athanasii*,' but in the Ambrosian the heading is simply '*Symbolum*.' In one British Museum manuscript the title '*Athanasius*' is found. The date of the Psalter which contains this heading is said to be A.D. 1200. Other titles were, '*Fides Catholica*,' '*Expositio*,' '*Sermo*,' '*Libellus*' (once); *Psalmus* frequently, in the days immediately preceding the Reformation in England. The articles of Regino and the Autun Canon—whatever their dates may be is of no consequence in this connection—both go to prove that it was for the use of the teacher and not for those who were being taught. "*Si quis Presbyter, Diaconus, sub-diaconus, vel Clericus. . . . Fidem sancti Athanasii præsulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit, ab Episcopo condemnetur*" (Harduin, iii., 1016.) Regino's

article directs that the clergy are to be asked whether each 'knows by heart the discourse (Sermo) of Bishop Athanasius concerning the Holy Trinity' (Regino, 'De Discipl. Eccles.,' i.). And Waterland quotes Ratherius near the end of the tenth century as exhorting his clergy thus: 'Illum sancti Athanasii (quæ ita incipit, Quicumque vult) Sermonem memoriter teneat' (Waterland, cap. ii.). In the Psalters it was found for the most part among the Hymns or Canticles, as we have seen was the case in the Vienna manuscript, and Professor Swainson has remarked ('Letter to the Dean of Chichester,' 1870), 'That in Constitutions proceeding from Synods held respectively at Worcester, Durham, and Exeter in the years 1240, 1255, 1287, the title given to our Creed was still the Psalm, Quicumque vult, and that in each of these synodical Constitutions it is expressly distinguished from the Creeds.' But 'it is exhibited to our contemporaries more as a Creed than as a Psalm. Yet much evidence shows that whatever was the title given to it, it was regarded chiefly as a Psalm before and in the early days of the Reformation. It is pointed as a Psalm, it was used as a Psalm at Prime: in the little volume of Edward Whytechurch, put forth about the year 1542, it was placed among the Canticles. In his book on the Creeds, "*De Tribus Symbolis*," Luther spoke of the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the *Te Deum* as the three Creeds of the Church, and also called the *Te Deum*, with which he classed the "Quicumque," the third Symbol ascribed to St. Ambrose and St. Augustine' (Swainson, *ut supra*, p. 34). The old Service-Books contain many instances of expositions of the Symbol such as were taught to the Catechumens before they came to be baptized. That the need of some such exposition on the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation was deeply felt, we know from the speech of Paulinus at the Council of Friuli. It is a commentary—exposition—that they need; not a new Creed, but an exposition of the Creed. This is exactly the purpose for which the 'Quicumque' was originally composed. Waterland's own opinion, as well as many of those whose words he quotes, was that 'Expositio,' and not 'Symbolum,' was the proper title for it. By this name, or a similar one, it is referred to for a long time. Hincmar spoke of the 'Sermo Athanasii de fide'; others,

'*Libellus Athanasii de fide: expositio Catholicæ fidei Athanasii.*' The legates of Pope Gregory IX. at Constantinople in 1233 called it ἡ ἐκθεσις τῆς πίστεως; John Cyparissiota, A.D. 1360, spoke of it as '*Expositio fidei.*' Each of the explanations of the Apostles' Creed in Martene, pp. 33, 35, is entitled '*Expositio.*' What we call the Creed of Constantinople was regarded at first simply as an illustration of the Creed of Nicæa, and was distinguished from it by its title. The Nicene was called ἡ πίστις, of the 318 fathers who met at Nicæa; the other, until it was magnified so as to supplant the Nicene, was commonly known as διδασκαλία, or ἡ ἐκθεσις, of the 150 who were assembled at Constantinople. It was not until A.D. 1662 that the '*Quicunque*' was exalted into the place and rank of a Creed in the English Church, when it was ordered to be used instead of the Apostles' Creed on certain festival days of the Church's year, numbering in all thirteen. We come, then, to the following conclusions: (1) That the document was never designed for use as a *Symbolum* proper; (2) That it was originally an exposition of the Faith of the Church to be used by the Priest in the instruction of Catechumens; not a Creed, but an exposition of the Creed.

As an '*Exposition of the Faith*' it is unique. The earlier Creeds contained the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity implicitly; in the composition before us there is an explicit declaration of this doctrine. In the earlier Creeds, as in Holy Scripture generally, the Unity of the Godhead is taken for granted. In this Creed we have at once a simple and masterly exposition, not only of the Unity of the Godhead, but also of the true Deity of the Three Persons of the Godhead, and of the relation to each other of the two Natures of our Lord Jesus Christ. This, again, in earlier Creeds was simply asserted as '*co-existent in His Person.*' Sabellianism, in its attempt to explain the mystery of the Trinity, confounded the Persons; Arianism, in its attempt to defend Christianity from a charge of polytheism, fell into the blasphemous error of denying the Divinity of Christ, and thus of '*dividing the substance.*' In later days various attempts were made to explain the mystery of Christ's Person by Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches. All

these attempts are clearly rejected by our document, which explicitly draws out the doctrinal teaching implicitly contained in the New Testament.

In fact, as the late Dr. Schaff, 'Church History,' vol. iii., p. 690, says : 'This Creed is unsurpassed as a masterpiece of logical clearness, rigour, and precision.'

CHAPTER XX.

IN WHAT LANGUAGE WAS THE 'QUICUNQUE' COMPOSED,
AND IN WHAT COUNTRY DID IT ORIGINATE?

IT was for long believed that this exposition—for we take leave so to call it—was written in Greek, the language of the great Athanasius. And when doubts began to arise respecting this, it was urged (Baronius) that the great doctor composed it when in exile, or that it was the result of his sojourn in Gaul. 'Athanasius dum esset Rome, scripsit latine Symbolum et recitavit coram Pontifice et ei assidentibus,' Ann. 340, ut scribit Baronius (Gavantus, 'Commentar. in Rubric Breviarii Romani,' p. 106). Both theories have long since been abandoned, and there is no manner of doubt but that the original language of its composition was Latin. But in the days of the formation of our Prayer-Book it was not so thought. For, says Professor Swainson, 'Letter to Dean Hook,' p. 30, 'the framers of our Prayer-Book believed, as almost everyone else believed at the time, that the Creed was a genuine composition of Athanasius, and elected to take their version from what they deemed the Greek original rather than from a Latin copy. The fact was, that the compilers of our Prayer-Book were misled by a Greek Creed, published at Basle about the year 1540, into the supposition that this Greek was the original, and the received Latin merely an imperfect translation;' and from 1549 until now (with the exception of the period during which Mary reigned, when Cardinal Pole's Primer was used, which contained a translation from the Latin) the version which has been in use amongst us has been a translation from this Greek copy. But before the Reformation, a version which had been made from the Latin had been printed in what is commonly called

Bishop Hilsey's Primer, published in 1539. About 1542 another translation was published by Edward Whytechurch. It has been printed by Dr. Swainson in his 'Letter to the Dean of Chichester,' 1870, pp. 18-21. This was included in a sheet which contained the following: The Song of the Children in the Oven; the Song of the Virgin; the Song of Zachary the Prophet; the Song of Symeon; the Song of Augustine and Ambrose; the Crede or Symbole of Doctour Athanasius called 'Quicumque vult'; and these were appended to what is described as an 'interesting Psalter of David in English, truly translated out of the Latin.' The whole of the 'Quicumque' document betrays a Latin original, and the entire absence of any Greek versions, except such as exhibit the Faith in its complete and latest form, certainly points to only one conclusion.

The Polish nobleman Cazanovius (whose name is mentioned by Waterland) wrote to Calvin on the subject of the authorship of the Athanasian Creed, and pointed out that it could not have been composed by Athanasius, as none of the copies of the Creed were in Greek. But a book in Greek on the Procession of the Holy Spirit came to Paris, which (as was thought) set the matter at rest. For 'this book contained a Greek copy of the Creed: and nearly allied to it was another copy, which Nicolas Bryling published at Basle, and afterwards Henry Stephens at Paris in the year 1565' (Gilbert Genebrard, Notes on the Athanasian Creed in his work on The Holy Trinity, published 1569).

In 1642 Vossius maintained a Latin original in his 'De Tribus Symbolis.' In 1644 Petavius maintained the same in his 'De Trinit.,' lib. vii., cap. viii. Our own Bishop Pearson was of the same opinion (Article VIII., note). Cabassutius, Dupin, Montfauçon, and Fabricius, and all moderns, excepting, perhaps, Mr. Brewer, have declared that its original language was Latin. And the reason given just above is of no little weight in this matter. Had any of the half-developed copies of the Creed found in any of the ancient manuscripts been in Greek, it would have made the matter more difficult to decide. But they are not. All the most ancient and fragmentary copies are in Latin. Dr. Swainson mentions in one place that he had seen twenty-two manuscripts of the Creed, and obtained collations of six more.

He adds, 'each of these is found in an ancient Psalter, *i.e.*, not in a book of dogmatic theology, but in one of a devotional character.' All the Psalters for some centuries, that is between, say, 700 and 1200, with the exception of the famous Irish Psalter now in the possession of St. John's College, Cambridge, seem to have contained the 'Quicunque,' not always indeed occupying the same position, but finding a place somewhere in the Psalter.

That the birthplace of our Athanasian Creed was Gaul is clear. It was in that country that it was first promulgated, and there it first gained acceptance. The earliest ancient manuscripts which contain it, as well as the earliest ancient testimonies, all attest this as indisputable. Out of the twenty-five manuscripts mentioned by Waterland as containing this Creed, ten are Gallic in their origin; while of the ancient testimonies cited by Waterland, which number some thirty six or so, seventeen are of Gallic origin; and of the ancient comments upon the Creed which the same writer quotes, five of the thirteen are Gallic also. It is therefore accepted as certain that its original language was Latin, and that its birthplace was Gaul.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE RECEPTION OF THE 'QUICUNQUE' INTO THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH.

THE older Symbols had their origin, and were for a long time in use as Professions of Faith, which were employed in connection with the instruction and preparation which took place previous to the admission of candidates to the Sacrament of Baptism. Later on, they were admitted into the Liturgical Services of the Church, especially into the most solemn and central service of Holy Communion, and we have found it to be possible to note almost the exact time at which they were so admitted. But when we come to inquire concerning the admission of the 'Quicunque' into the Liturgies of the Churches, we find almost as much difficulty as in discovering the date of its compilation. Of this we may be certain, that it, too, had done duty—part of it, perhaps, for a long period—as an exposition to be used in conjunction with the ancient Creeds, *but not as a third* Creed. The first part formed an excellent exposition—*Sermo, ἑκθεσις*—of the Catholic Faith of the Holy Trinity; the second part also ably dealt with the Catholic Doctrine of the Incarnation. For how long the first part was in use in this way we are unable to determine with any degree of certainty; only we are willing to allow to the Trèves manuscript a venerable antiquity, and it may well have been prepared as a defence of the Catholic Faith within its own limits about the time of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. It has been the opinion of some who have specialized on the 'Quicunque' that it was received into the services of the Church as early as 633, depending for this opinion upon the preamble to the proceedings of the Council of Toledo,

held in that year. But there is no evidence whatever of the welding of the 'Quicunque' into a whole, as we have it, until the close of the eighth century. Whatever is referred to by the Monks of Mount Olivet in their letter of 809, under the name of the 'Faith of Athanasius,' *may* have been used in the services of those monks in their monastery. They do not expressly say so, but they refer to it in confirmation of a doctrine which they were reprimanded by a certain monk for holding. But in the Constitutions of Hatto, Bishop of Basle, who died A.D. 836, for the regulation of the clergy of his diocese, the fourth is, 'That they should have the Faith of Athanasius by heart, and recite it at Prime every Lord's Day' (Basil, 'Capitul. apud Harduin'). Among the 'Instructions' which Anscharius, Archbishop of Hamburg and Breme, A.D. 865, gave when dying, there is this: 'That they should be careful to recite the Catholic Faith composed by Athanasius' (Anscharius, 'Vit. apud Petr. Lambec'). The Utrecht Psalter; King Athelstan's Psalter; the Prayer-Book of Charles the Bald; the Vienna manuscript, *said* to have been the property of Hildegard, though this is very unlikely; the Psalter in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, supposed by Waterland to be of the date A.D. 850, and a second in the same library, which, from a date in the Litany, appears to have been written in the year 883: 'Oratur, ut Marinum Apostolicum in Sancta religione conservare digneris, ut Karlo-magnum Regem perpetua prosperitate conservare digneris: ut Reginam conservare digneris: ut Fulconem Episcopum cum omni grege sibi commisso in tuo apto servitio conservare digneris.'

All these are evidence that during the ninth century it was certainly in use pretty generally, and therefore in England, and we have no quarrel with the date set down by Waterland for this—viz., 880. It was probably received at Rome in the same way about 930. It is worthy of notice that it is almost invariably found inserted in the Psalters among the Canticles and Hymns. Indeed, it is by no means unusual to find it referred to as 'Hymnus Athanasii'; as Waterland says, p. 54, it was 'a title which seems to have been then customary in England.' Honorius, of Autun, A.D. 1130, tells us that the 'Quicunque' was in

daily use at Prime, and we have the same evidence repeated by Paululus, a priest at Amiens, fifty years later ; but it would seem that at that time, so far as Amiens was concerned, the practice was of comparatively recent introduction ; for Paululus, in speaking of the services recited at Prime, says : ‘ Hereunto the devotion of the faithful has added the “ Quicunque vult,” so that at no hour of the day may we forget the Articles of the Faith which are necessary to salvation.’

Before and up to the Reformation, as is well known, the ‘ Quicunque ’ was read daily in the English Church ; and it may be well to mention here that in the proceedings of synods, held respectively at Worcester, Durham, and Exeter, in the years 1240, 1255, 1287, the title given to the ‘ Quicunque ’ was the ‘ Psalm Quicunque vult.’ The Bishop of Worcester at that time was Walter de Cantilupe, and of Durham, Walter de Kirkham. In the Sarum Breviary it was appointed for the service of Prime ; there sung as a Psalm in connection with the other Psalms of the service ; used, of course, in Latin, and in a service which was hardly a service for the people. Once more with regard to its use. Albo, Abbot of Fleury, in 997 wrote an ‘ Apology,’ addressed to the two Kings of France, in which he refers to the ‘ Faith ’ which he has heard variously sung in alternate choirs, both in France and in the Church of England, and refers to the *Athanasian Form*.

The reception of the ‘ Quicunque ’ into the public services of the Church did not take place, it is clear, until about the middle of the ninth century. Even then it was not universal, and nearly a century elapsed before it was admitted at Rome. Previous to about A.D. 850, whatever of it existed appears to have been used by way of exposition of the Apostles’ Creed, for the elucidation of certain points which in that document were scarcely clear enough. From that date—A.D. 850—it began to find its way into the Psalters, Service-Books and Prayer-Books, and was placed, for the most part, among the Canticles and Hymns, and was referred to as such. It was sung or said daily at Prime, and so continued up to the Reformation. At the Reformation in England this was one of the practices particularly reformed, and from repeating it 365 times in the year, the practice was

restricted in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549) to its repetition six times in the year. Evidently the Reformers were of opinion that too much had been made of it. But it continued to be sung as a *Hymn, in addition* to the Apostles' Creed. In the second book the rubric preceding the Athanasian Creed was altered to include seven additional Feasts, thus bringing up the number to thirteen, at which it has remained ever since. In 1662 it was ordered to be recited *instead of* the Apostles' Creed. It is inserted in the Prayer-Book of the Church of Ireland, but there is no rubric ordering its use. In the Preface to the Revised Book, issued by authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, it is stated: 'With reference to the Athanasian Creed (commonly so-called), we have removed the Rubric directing its use on certain days; but in so doing, this Church has not withdrawn its witness, as expressed in the Articles of Religion, and here again renewed, to the truth of the Articles of the Christian Faith therein contained.' It has not been admitted into the Prayer-Book of the American Episcopal Church.

CHAPTER XXII.

SOURCES OF THE 'QUICUNQUE.'

THE tenth-century manuscript known as the 'Bouhier' Commentary is ascribed by the person who wrote the title to St. Augustine, probably because the language of the Commentary is largely drawn from the writings of that Father. It does not come within our present compass to give all the passages which occur in St. Augustine's writings which might be supposed to be the foundation of the major portion of the 'Quicunque'; to do so would be to swell our pages to inconvenient size. But we give below a few of the passages taken from his works which are distinctly parallel to clauses in the Creed:

'My brethren, before all things strive to have a right and undefiled faith, and keep in memory conformably to the rule of Apostolic doctrine the Creed composed by the holy (Nicene) Fathers, etc.' (Augustine, Occasional Sermon 1, 'On Quinquag.').

'The Catholic Faith separates the just from the unjust, not by the law of works, but of faith; because the just lives by faith. By which separation it may come to pass that a man, if he hold not the right and Catholic Faith towards God, may depart this life, however morally commendable, yet subject to damnation' ('Contra Two Letters of Pelagius').

'The Catholic Faith is that we venerate, believe, and worship and acknowledge one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity' (Occasional Sermon 181, 'On Vigil of Pentecost').

'The Catholic Faith, which neither confounds nor separates the Trinity, nor denies three Persons, nor believes

different substances ; it is by no means to be rejected' ('*Contra Maximinius*,' lib. iii.).

'It is sufficiently evident that with respect to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the power is one, the substance one, the Deity one, the majesty one, the glory one ; which one Lord, our God, is the very Trinity' (*Ibid.*).

'Such as the Father is, such is the Son, such the Holy Spirit' (Occasional Sermon 194, 'On the Trinity').

'For as the Father is Almighty and Ineffable, so is the Son Almighty and Incomprehensible, so also is the Holy Spirit Ineffable and Incomprehensible, being inseparably connected with the Father and the Son' ('On the Apostles' Words,' Sermon 1).

'The Father eternal, the Son co-eternal, the Holy Spirit co-eternal' ('On the Lord's Words,' Sermon 29).

'When the question turns upon the individuality of each (Person), the answer may be, "He is both God and Almighty" ; but when the question is about all together, the answer may be, "Not three Gods or three Almighties, but one God Almighty"' ('City of God,' lib. xi., cap. xxiv.).

'These three (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are not three Gods, nor three Almighties, but one Almighty, and the Trinity itself is one God, because Unity is necessary' ('On the Lord's Words,' Sermon 26).

'We worship and acknowledge not three Gods, but Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, one God' ('On the Creed').

'In the Trinity, then, which is God, the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God ; and, together, these three one God' ('*Contra Maximinius*,' lib. iii.).

'So, also, if you ask me, "Who is Lord?" I answer, "Each singly, but all together, I call not three Lords Gods, but one Lord God"' (*Ibid.*).

'A true Son, not created, but begotten' ('On the Creed').

'From the Father is the Son, from the Father is the Holy Spirit ; but the former is begotten, the latter proceeding' ('*Contra Maximinius*').

'In that Trinity, therefore, which is God, there is one Father, not two or three ; and one Son, not two or three ;

and one Spirit of both, not two or three' ('Contra Maximinus').

'Itaque Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus' ('De Trin.,' lib. v., cap. viii.).

'Nec tamen Tres Omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens' (*Ibid.*).

'Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus Sanctus' (*Ibid.*, lib. viii., cap. i.).

'Nec tamen tres Dii—sed unus Deus' (*Ibid.*).

'In hac Trinitate, non est aliud alio majus, aut minus' (Occasional Sermon 184).

'Equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead; inferior to the Father, as touching the flesh, that is, touching the Manhood' ('Ep. ad Volusianum').

'Proinde, Christus Jesus, Dei Filius, est et Deus et Homo' ('Enchirid.').

'Not two Christs, nor two Sons of God, but one Person, one Christ, the Son of God, and the same one Christ; not another Son of Man, but the Son of God according to His Godhead, Son of Man according to the flesh' ('On the Apostles' Words,' Sermon 14).

'The Word was made flesh, yet by assuming man, not by exchanging Godhead' (Occasional Sermon 15, 'On the Trinity'; 'Enchirid.,' cap. xxxv.).

'Idem Deus qui Homo, et qui Deus idem Homo: non confusione naturæ, sed unitate personæ' (Occasional Sermon 15, 'On the Nativity').

'For as by unity of person soul is united to body to make man, so in unity of person God is united to man to make Christ' ('Epis. ad Volusianum').

'Sicut enim unus est Homo Anima rationalis et Caro; sic unus est Christus Deus et Homo' (Tract in Johan. lxxviii. 3).

'Take care to remember and faithfully hold the Christian profession, that He rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and will come from no other place than thence to judge the quick and the dead' ('Epis. ad Dardanum,' 57).

'Cavete, dilectissimi, ne quis vos ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Fide ac unitate seducat. Qui enim vobis aliter Evangelizaverit præterquam quod accepistis, Anathema sit' (Aug., tom. v.).

'In the Catholic Faith you should know, my beloved, is alone true faith, sincere peace, everlasting salvation.'

Mr. Wigan Harvey's theory that the 'Quicunque' laid the foundation for the after-production of St. Augustine's 'De Trinitate' has not commended itself to the minds of thoughtful men and scholars. Much nearer the truth undoubtedly is the opposite opinion, that whoever composed the 'Quicunque' had *read* and digested the 'De Trinitate.'

If the works ascribed to Avitus, who was Bishop of Vienne in A.D. 490, and died in 523, be genuine, the following extract shows that at that early date there was some approximation to the language of some of the clauses of the 'Quicunque':

'De Divinitate Spiritus Sancti, quem nec factum legimus, nec creatum, nec genitum. Nos vero Spiritum discimus ex Patre Filioque procedere, . . . istud Fides Catholica etiamsi renuentibus non persuaserit, in suæ tamen Disciplinæ Regula non excedit' (Sirmond, *Op. Vid. Le Quien*, quoted by Waterland, note, cap. vii.; also in Ommaney, 'Critical Dissertation,' p. 2).

And, again, the following from a work ascribed to St. Augustine, but adjudged by the editors to be really the work of Cæsarius, who was Bishop of Arles in A.D. 503, and died 543:

'Rogo et admoneo vos, Fratres carissimi, ut Quicunque vult salvus esse, Fidem rectam et Catholicam discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conservet. Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus: sed tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credat unusquisque Fidelis quod Filius æqualis est Patri secundum Divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum Humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit.' Oudin also ascribes this to Cæsarius.

'The Holy Spirit was glorified in the Father with the Son; the power one, the substance one, the Godhead one' (Cyril, 'Catech.,' xvi.).

'If anyone shall not affirm that the Divinity of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is one; the majesty, power, equal; the glory, dominion, one; the kingdom one, and the will one, let him be excommunicated' (Augustine, 'On the Right Faith').

‘The Father is without beginning, the Son without beginning, the Spirit without beginning’ (Athanasius apud Suicerus, col. 301).

‘The Father eternal, the Son co-eternal, the Holy Spirit co-eternal’ (Augustine, ‘On the Lord’s Words, St. Luke xi.’).

Our next quotation is from the preamble to the proceedings of the Fourth Council of Toledo, held A.D. 633. Capitul. I. :

‘Nec personas confundimus, nec Substantiam separamus. Patrem a nullo factum, vel genitum dicimus : Filium a Patre non factum, sed genitum afferimus : Spiritum vero Sanctum nec creatum, nec genitum, sed procedentem a Patre et Filio profitemur, ipsum autem Dominum Jesum Christum—ex substantia Patris ante secula genitum—æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum Humanitatem. Hæc est Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Fides : Hanc Confessionem conservamus, atque tenemus. Quam quisquis firmissime custodierit, perpetuam Salutem habebit.’

This is plainly a portion of our first part, and which, likely enough, had been for a considerable time in circulation when this Council of A.D. 633 was held.

The Second Council of Toledo held A.D. 405 had expressed itself in the following manner : ‘Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, sed ingenitum profitemur ; ipse enim a nullo originem ducit, ex quo et Filius nativitatem, et Spiritus Sanctus processionem accepit. Fons ergo ipse et origo est totius Divinitatis.’

In the eighth century controversy was rife, and during a great portion of the century ecclesiasticism was exceedingly active under the patronage of Charlemagne and his Queen Hildegard. Men of culture and learning gravitated towards the French Court, and the most illustrious men of letters of the time found a liberal patron in the French King. The quotations below are from the ‘Libellus’ of the Italian Bishops at the Frankfort Council, A.D. 794 ; the letter of Charlemagne ; and the speech of Paulinus at Forum Julii, A.D. 796. The ‘Libellus’ of Frankfort, A.D. 794, contains the following :

‘The Catholic and Apostolic Church confesses that the Father should be believed distinct . . . and that the Son should be believed distinct . . . and that the Holy Ghost

should be believed distinct, because He is the Holy Ghost, and proceeds from the Father and the Son. And the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are not different in nature, but are inseparably one, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Not one person but one nature, because there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost, but the unspeakable Majesty of the Divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is one, equal, consubstantial, and co-eternal. For we confess a Unity in essence, but preach a Trinity in the division of the Persons. . . . He continued to be true and Almighty God in both natures, one Son of God, and likewise Son of man. For the human birth has not prejudiced the Divine birth. He took that which He was not, He remained essentially that which He was before, not having suffered commingling or division, but in the one person of Christ there remains true God and true man' (Mansi, xiii., p. 878 ; *cf.* Lumby, pp. 236-238).

The speech of Paulinus at Friuli, A.D. 796, contains the following remarks: 'I confess that the holy, perfect, and inseparable and ineffable and very Trinity, that is, Father and Son and Holy Ghost, is indivisible in the unity of its nature, because God is three and one. Three namely by distinction of Persons, but one by the inseparable substance of the Deity. . . . For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost. But the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are not three Gods, but God is one. For the Father, very God, is really and properly a Father, . . . and the Son, very God, is really and properly a Son, . . . and the Holy Ghost, very God, is really and properly the Holy Ghost, not begotten nor created, but proceeding from the Father and the Son. . . . And there is nothing in the Holy Trinity at all differing, or unlike, or unequal. In their nature there is no division, in their persons no confusion, nothing greater or less. None is earlier or later, none inferior or superior; but their power is one and equal, their glory alike, their Majesty everlasting, co-eternal, and consubstantial. . . . Consubstantial with God the Father in His own, that is the Divine, nature, consubstantial also with His mother, without taint of sin, in our, that is, the human nature. . . . Of the nature of the Father, according to His Divinity, of the nature of

His mother, according to His humanity, yet in both belonging to the Father, because, as has been said, there are not two Sons of God, one of God and another of man ; but one Christ Jesus by reason of the One Person, Son of God and man, very God and very man, of a reasonable soul and very flesh ; perfect man according to His humanity, perfect God according to His Divinity. . . . He will come again to judge the quick and the dead, and the world by fire, to render to each according to his works, namely, to the impious everlasting punishment, but to the "just, life eternal" (Migne, xcix. 293 ; Lumby, pp. 245-250).

The letter of Charlemagne is on the same lines. He says : ' We believe the same Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be of one substance, one power, and one essence, three Persons, and each single Person in the Trinity fully God, and all the three Persons one God Almighty ; the Father unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son. . . . The Father is eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal, proceeding from the Father and the Son. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is one God Almighty, . . . eternal, ineffable, incomprehensible. In which Holy Trinity there is no Person either later in time, or inferior in degree, or less in power ; but in all things the Son is equal to the Father, the Holy Ghost equal to the Father and the Son in Divinity, Will, Operation, and Glory. Only distinct in Person is the Father, distinct in Person is the Son, distinct in Person is the Holy Ghost. . . . The Person of the Son was . . . incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, . . . in His Divinity perfect God, in His humanity perfect man ; . . . in the form of God, equal to the Father ; in the form of a servant, less than the Father. We also believe that all men will rise, and each be judged according to his works ; that the impious are to be condemned to eternal punishment with the devil and his angels ; but the righteous to be crowned with eternal glory with Christ and His holy angels for endless ages. This is the Catholic Faith, and therefore ours ' (Mansi, xiii., p. 905 ; Lumby, pp. 240-242).

The first Canon of the Council of Arles, held A.D. 813 also contains the following : ' We confess that the Father the Son, and the Holy Ghost are of one Godhead and sub

stance ; while accepting the Trinity in a diversity of Persons, we neither confound the Persons nor divide the substance. We say the Father is made of none nor begotten ; we assert that the Son is of the Father, not made but begotten ; we profess, moreover, that the Holy Ghost is neither created nor begotten, but proceeding from the Father and the Son. . . . For He (the Lord Jesus Christ) was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the holy glorious Mary, Mother of God, and He one of the Holy Trinity, the same Lord Jesus Christ, alone being born of her, assuming soul and flesh, a perfect humanity, without sin, remaining what He was, assuming what He was not, equal to the Father in respect of His Godhead, inferior to the Father in respect of His Manhood. . . . We . . . being about to be raised by Him at the last day in that flesh wherein we now live, and in that form in which the same Lord arose, some to receive from Him the deserts of their justice eternal life, others for their sins the sentence of eternal punishment. This is the Faith of the Catholic Church, this confession we keep and hold, which whosoever shall most firmly guard shall have everlasting salvation' (Mansi, xiv., p. 58 ; Canon I. ; Lumby, pp. 254, 255).

It will be seen that the expressions are gradually being rounded towards that form which is familiar, even if harsh in some instances, to our ears. But it is impossible to understand why, if the 'Quicunque' was at that time—up to A.D. 813—in existence in the complete form in which we have it, it was not made use of, instead of the long, rambling, and verbose statements from which the above extracts are taken.

The truth appears to us to be (1) That its welding into a complete whole belongs to a date subsequent to A.D. 813. (2) That before that time two separate compositions were in use as expositions of the Catholic Faith of the Trinity and the Catholic Faith of the Incarnation. (3) That the authorship probably belongs to no one man, but that for a time the text was unsettled, and eventually by the 'improvement' of one and another it was rounded off to the form in which we know it. (4) That the major portion of the whole is to be found in the works of St. Augustine. (5) That the 'Damnatory' clauses are not found in their harsh form previous to the ninth century.

And with regard to the quotations from Hincmar, of which Dr. Waterland made much, they are all quoted from the first part of our compilation, and it has been pointed out by Dr. Swainson ('Formation of the Athanasian Creed,' p. 88) that Hincmar quotes some of the clauses from Sophronius.

We may fitly conclude with the words of Dr. Lumby, pp. 259, 260 : 'On every ground, therefore, both of internal and external evidence, it seems to be a sound conclusion that somewhere between A.D. 813 and 850 the Creed was brought nearly into the form in which we now use it ; that before the earlier of these dates it was not known, but that in Gaul, at least, it gained general acceptance soon after the middle of the ninth century ; and that the strong expressions of its warning clauses are to be traced to the fierce contests which at that period agitated the whole ecclesiastical world.'

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE 'DAMNATORY' CLAUSES.

THE controversies which have raged around the 'Quicunque' have not all been concerned with the questions of authorship, date, and place of origin. Interesting as these have been, and heated as they have sometimes become, they nevertheless sink into an insignificance almost complete when compared with the fierceness of the controversy which has been evoked by what are called the 'Damnatory' clauses. And truly, the language of our version is startling, and to supersensitive minds it is positively offensive. For it says—undoubtedly this is the language of our 'Quicunque'—that, unless a man hold the Catholic Faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. It seems to us, however, that a large amount of the opposition which is frequently displayed against this formula arises, we will not say from ignorance and prejudice, or even 'from a repudiation of all authority in matters of religious belief,' but from want of a little patient consideration. For what is this Catholic Faith, which every man who desires to be saved must hold so tenaciously and faithfully? In brief, it may be said to be all contained in clauses 3, 4, 5, 6. Clause 7 begins an amplification of the doctrines enunciated in clauses 3-6; and this amplification is carried on through a number of succeeding clauses. So that what a man is required to believe as the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is really contained in clauses 3-6. We do not say that the Warning clauses are model expressions, framed in the best possible way: on the contrary, we have to record our conviction that its revision ought to be undertaken as speedily as possible, and instead of perpetuating

the mistake of translating from a GREEK VERSION, the Revisers should adopt, in general, say, the text which was in use in England prior to the Reformation. But for the present distress, and until Revision has been accomplished, we submit that clauses 1 and 2 and the last are in nowise harmful, nor need they cause one moment's perturbation to any sincere believer. They are WARNING clauses addressed to all who hear the true Catholic doctrine, with the object of preventing their being misled by some one or other of the many forms of heretical teaching current in the world. The short summary of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity which follows in clauses 3-6 is followed by explanations and amplifications which were inserted in the days when heresy respecting this and other doctrines was rife in many lands. Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian; the speculations of philosophy; the Macedonian heresy; and the various forms of unbelief and of misbelief made it necessary for the Church to define the true Catholic doctrines. And when even its authoritative definitions were found, as in Paulinus's days, too compendious, and the truth stated with too much brevity, this formula, designed as an EXPOSITION of the Creeds, came to the rescue. All the chief ancient heresies find their rebuke and refutation in the brief and crisp statements of the 'Quicunque.'

Remembering, then, that these statements, framed in another age, when the minds of men regarding such things were neither so sensitive nor so hypercritical, and remarking that strong evils call for strong remedies to be used in counteracting them, it is not as surprising as might at first sight appear that the language of the 'Quicunque' is as forceful as we find it to be. At all events, of this we may rest assured, that its language is in nowise directed against any sincere believer who can accept the so-called Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. We are advocates, not for its removal from the Prayer-Book—far be that from us—nor for the insertion in the Rubric of a clause making its use optional; for this would mean that in some parishes it would be used with great frequency, and in others not at all; but for a revision of its language, by careful comparison with those manuscripts of it which are acknowledged the oldest and best, and a Declaration respecting the original intention of

its compilers, and a Restoration of it to its pre-Reformation position, as a Hymn to be used, not in place of, but in addition to, the Apostles' Creed. It is too valuable a possession to be let go, since it enshrines two most important and precious doctrines of the Catholic Church. The 'Damnatory' clauses are additions to the formula; they are declarations respecting the doctrines; but they are not the doctrines themselves, nor are they found in many of the old manuscripts and versions of the compilation. They are not found in Denebert's Confession, A.D. 798; nor in the Colbertine copy of the Trèves manuscript, unless the last clause of that manuscript be misread. This last clause is quite unobjectionable, and would be very well suited for use in a revised 'Quicumque.' It reads as follows: 'Hæc est fides vera et Catholica quam omnis homo qui ad vitam æternam pervenire deciderat scire integre debet et fideliter custodire.'

They are not found in the Oxford manuscript, Junius 25, nor in Fortunatus' 'Exposition'; in neither copy is there any reference to, or explanation of, the clauses 28 and 29. They are not in the quotations from Hincmar, 'De non trinâ Deitate' (Migne, cxxv., p. 553). Clause 2 is indeed in the Vienna manuscript, but clause 26, or its representative in that manuscript, reads thus: 'Quicumque ergo cupit salvus esse et Catholicus hæc teneat et credat, et vita vivet.'

And when we turn to more ancient testimony, and search for parallels to these clauses in St. Augustine's works, we note that those brought forward by Waterland are couched in language of a much milder tone than are their modern representatives. Clause 2 in Waterland is represented by: 'Hæc est Fides nostra, quoniam hæc est Fides recta, quæ etiam Catholica nuncupatur.' Clause 26 by the same, and clause 42 by: 'Cavete, dilectissimi, ne quis vos ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Fide ac unitate seducat. Qui enim vobis aliter Evangelizaverit præterquam quod accepistis, Anathema sit.'

In his 'Early History of the Athanasian Creed,' pp. 215, 216, Mr. Ommaney spoke of these condemnatory clauses as being contained in all the ancient manuscripts. He says: 'The striking accordance of the ancient manuscripts

as regards the text of the Creed is particularly remarkable with reference to the condemnatory clauses. Not a single manuscript of the Creed has been found from which they are absent, or in which they are found with any important variation from the received text. The Trèves fragment cannot be cited as an exception, for the reason above mentioned, that it is not a copy of the Creed, nor even of a portion of it.' But—and this seems to us remarkable—he goes on to admit that 'all the copies of the Commentary of Fortunatus, with the exception of that at Milan' (which manuscript is of the eleventh century, and the only one that ascribes it to Venantius Fortunatus), 'omit to quote the second verse, but they also omit to quote other verses; and such omission is no proof whatever of their absence or of the absence of any one of them from the text of the Creed at the time when the Commentary was composed. The same may be said of the "Troyes" Commentary, which likewise omits to quote the second verse, and also omits to quote much of the Creed besides, much more indeed than the Commentary of Fortunatus does, although it clearly has for its subject the whole of the document. The omission of the words "absque dubio" in the second verse by Paris, 4858, cannot be deemed significant, inasmuch as that is the only ancient manuscript from which they are absent.'

Our firm conviction is that the reason why these clauses and phrases are omitted in the Commentaries cited is that they found no place in those copies of the Creed upon which the Commentaries were founded.

Paulinus never quotes, and never seems to refer to the 'Damnatory' clauses of our 'Quicunque.' Hincmar, in his address to Gotteschalk, begins the Catholic Faith with our clause 3. Archbishop Peckham, known as Friar John, issued in 1281 some constitutions; they may be seen, in English, in Johnson, *Canons*, Anglo-Catholic Library, vol. ii., p. 271. The ninth constitution enacts that, amongst other things, each parish priest should expound (either by himself or by deputy) to his people, in the vulgar tongue, the fourteen Articles of the Faith, the ten Commandments of the Decalogue, the two precepts of the Gospel, the seven works of mercy, and so on. These fourteen Articles of the Faith are divided into two groups

of seven ; the first relating to the Trinity and the operation of God, the other seven to Christ's humanity. But there are no 'Damnatory' clauses. Again, on turning to the Sarum Missal, sixteenth-century edition, as reprinted in Maskell, these fourteen Articles are taken up all but verbatim, and used in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. The Articles of Peckham's constitutions are made the vehicle for instructing the sick man. The 'Damnatory' Clauses appear in what Dr. Swainson called their original character. 'Et ideo, si salvus esse volueris, ante omnia opus est, ut teneas Catholicam fidem : quam nisi integram inviolatamque servaveris, absque dubio in æternum peribis. Fides autem Catholica hæc est, frater. Credere in unum Deum,' etc. When the first seven Articles have been rehearsed, there occurs : 'Si vis ergo salvus esse, frater, ita de mysterio Trinitatis sentias.'

Then followed the other seven Articles, at the end of which came, 'Hæc est fides Catholica, frater, quam nisi fideliter firmiterque credideris, sicut Mater Ecclesia credit, salvus esse non poteris.' Clauses 2 and 42 might without any damage to doctrine be omitted altogether. For 'must think,' etc., in clause 28, it would be better to substitute the old reading, 'let him thus think of the Trinity.' For, as Dr. Swainson remarked, words have changed their meanings since the Rubrics were composed and the last Revision took place. Our language was in a state of transition when King Edward's First Prayer-Book was issued, and the words in the Rubric of the Marriage Service which directed that the newly-married people *must* receive the Holy Communion, etc., were altered at the last revision to 'it is convenient,' etc. But if clauses 2 and 42 must be retained, let them be so revised as not to damage the truth, and, while cause of offence and stumbling is removed, let the true faith and the warning respecting the necessity of holding and maintaining it be preserved. Attempts have been made to obtain various alterations by members of the Convocations of Canterbury and York. But only in the Convocation of Canterbury has success been achieved. The Declaration given below was submitted to the Canterbury Convocation on July 1-3, 1879, but the same, on being submitted to the York Convocation, was rejected by that body. The Canterbury

Convocation agreed to append to the Athanasian Creed the following declaration :

‘For the removal of doubts and to prevent disquietude in the use of the Creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, it is here solemnly declared :

1. ‘That the Confession of our Christian faith commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius doth not make any addition to the Faith as contained in Holy Scripture, but warneth against errors which from time to time have arisen in the Church of Christ.’

2. ‘That as Holy Scripture in divers places doth promise life to them that believe, and declare the condemnation of them that believe not, so doth the Church in this confession declare the necessity, for all who would be in a state of salvation, of holding fast the Catholic Faith, and the great peril of rejecting the same. Wherefore the warnings in this Confession of Faith are to be understood no otherwise than the like warnings of Holy Scripture ; for we must receive God’s threatenings, even as His promises, in such wise as they are generally set forth in Holy Writ. Moreover, the Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the Judge of all.’

In conclusion, the only question of real importance is that which concerns the subject-matter of this so-called Creed. We bring it to the test of the Scriptures, and we find warnings there in abundance, and in strong language too. We cannot adulterate the message of the Gospel either by addition or diminution. The words of the late Cardinal Newman on this subject will not soon be forgotten, and they deserve to be remembered. ‘The Athanasian Creed,’ he says, ‘is not a mere collection of notions, however momentous : it is a Psalm, a hymn of praise, of confession and of profound homage, parallel to the Canticles of the elect in the Apocalypse. It appeals to the imagination as much as to the intellect. It is the war-song of faith with which we first warn ourselves, and then each other, and then all who are within its hearing and the hearing of the truth, Who our God is, and how we must worship Him, and how vast our responsibility will be if we know what to believe, and yet believe not.’

This Creed, as we call it, has an office peculiarly its own.

It touches upon a part of the Gospel message on which the others are silent, and it reminds us at times when it is read or chanted, that the Saviour came in order that they that believe on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life; it reminds us that that everlasting life is ours now, and that we must not let it go; and it reminds us, too, that he that believeth not the Son has been condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the Son of God. So far, then, from this 'Creed confining itself to mere dogma, it insists more directly and expressly than does either of the others on the absolute necessity of personal holiness.' This is its grand concluding message. May the truths which it enunciates and the blessed message which it brings be treasured and loved by us always and ever.

The recent work of Mr. Ommaney, 'A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed,' was noticed at considerable length, and in a very laudatory manner, in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October, 1897, pp. 80-94. With very much that is there said in praise of the work we are in entire agreement. With respect to authorship the writer says (p. 90): 'The problem is to find a Latin theologian who lived during the later Nestorian epoch and was conversant with its theology, and with the writings of St. Augustine.' Quite so; this *is the* problem as regards authorship; but this is exactly what every writer on the subject thus far has failed to do. There is no man in that epoch known to history who fulfils these conditions. The 'Commonitorium' of St. Vincent of Lerins has, as we have already seen, a correspondence of words and phrases with the 'Quicumque' in several clauses; but when we come to inquire concerning the minatory clauses we are struck by the weakness of the parallels which can be drawn from the work of St. Vincent.

Referring to these warning clauses, the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* (p. 94) says: 'With a word on one curious objection we will conclude. We have heard the point argued that, as we no longer repeat the Nicene anathema after the Creed in the Liturgy, so we might, in keeping with the toleration of the times, omit the clauses which cause distress to some in the "Quicumque." One

answer to this, at least, is that the Nicene anathema never formed an integral part of the Creed to which it belonged, as the clauses in question in the "Quicunque" undoubtedly do form.' But to this we may reply: Yet the anathema appended to the original Nicene Creed had to be accepted with the Creed itself, just as though it had been an integral part of it. And with regard to both the Nicene Creed and the 'Quicunque' it must never be forgotten that although they safeguard Divine truths, they are not the Divine truths themselves. 'It is,' the reviewer proceeds to remark, 'the duty of the Church to repeat the words of her Divine Head; or, rather, He now speaks by her the same words as He spoke on earth in the days of His flesh. And when the Church repeats the "Quicunque vult" she is understood to speak with all the fulness of meaning, and with all the qualifications of justice and mercy, with which Christ our Lord spoke; and she means what He meant, no more and no less, when He said, "He that believeth not shall be damned." That is to say, as we can never too often repeat, the difficulty presented by the minatory clauses has its roots not in the Prayer-Book, but in the Bible.' But we may reply: 'The "Quicunque" is not part of Holy Scripture, and Holy Scripture does not descend to such particularization about many mysterious points' (as the 'Quicunque' does), and then say, 'Except a man believe all this, and in every particular, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' Warnings there are in Holy Scripture, and in abundance, as to the danger of refusing to believe; the 'Quicunque' also warns, but its warnings are of a different tone to those contained in the Bible. And although it be true, as it undoubtedly is, that the necessity for a right belief, a right faith, is strongly insisted upon in Holy Scripture, yet Holy Scripture does not require every man to understand and know the distinctions, particularizations and definitions of the Articles of the Faith in the way that the 'Quicunque' does, on failure to do which a man is by it everlastingly condemned. What is needed is not the removal of the 'Quicunque' from the Prayer-Book, or the complete excision of its warning clauses, but such a revision of its language and explanation of its real meaning as every Christian may without difficulty understand, that all causes of scruple and doubtfulness may be removed.

The Pan-Anglican Conference of Bishops which meets every ten years, at the last Conference, 1897, laid upon the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate of the whole Anglican Church the charge of taking the necessary steps for a re-translation of the Athanasian Creed. 'This commission,' remarked a prominent English newspaper, the *World*, 'is the more interesting from the fact of Dr. Temple's former close association with the Broad Church party, to which the Creed in question has ever been a stumbling-block and a rock of offence.' It is generally understood that the main object of the proposed re-translation is to modify the, at present, uncompromising English rendering of the 'Damnatory' clauses. The new translators to whom the Archbishop may resort will have a task of peculiar delicacy, for if they proceed too far in a liberal direction they may find themselves accused by some imitator of Lord Westbury of 'depriving large numbers of devout persons of their last hope of everlasting damnation.' The issue is awaited with the deepest interest by all sections of Churchmen, specially those who for long have contended that such a step was necessary in the best interests of the Church.

The Bodleian manuscript, Junius 25, which has been referred to already, and which Dr. Swainson believed to be the most ancient Comment upon the 'Quicumque,' appears to us rather in the light of what we might call a tentative copy of the Creed, out of which the form now in use might very well emerge. Creeds and Expositions of the Faith in their complete and rounded forms were not born in a day; and this Junius manuscript may very well represent the almost final draft text of the Athanasian Creed. The title is 'Fides Catholica,' and its wording is as follows: 'Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem. Ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur; neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia persona Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti; Pater est ingenitus, Filius a Patre solo est genitus; Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio est procedens. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas, æqualis gloria, coæterna majestas. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus; increatus Pater,

increated Filius, increatus et Spiritus Sanctus ; immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus et Spiritus Sanctus ; æternus Pater, æternus Filius, æternus et Spiritus Sanctus. Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens et Spiritus Sanctus. Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus. Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus et Spiritus Sanctus. Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque Personam et Deum et Dominum confiteri, Christiana veritate compellimur ; ita in his tribus Personis non tres Deos nec tres Dominos, sed unum Deum et unum Dominum confitemur. Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres ; unus Filius, non tres Filii ; unus Spiritus Sanctus, non tres Spiritus Sancti. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei filius, Deus pariter et homo est. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus. Perfectus Deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistit ; æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem ; qui . . . Deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed unus est Christus. Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carne, sed assumptione humanitatis in Deo ; unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus ; qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit ad cœlos, sedit ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem ; et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam æternam, et qui vero mala in ignem æternum. Hæc est fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.'

In the translation of the 'Quicumque' in the Book of Common Prayer there are manifest imperfections, to which it may be worth while to call attention here. In verse 1 the original is, 'Quicumque vult salvus esse,' *i.e.*, Whoever desires to be in the way of salvation. In verse 25, 'In this Trinity none is afore or after other,' etc., means, In this

Trinity there is no such thing as before or after, greater or less. Verse 28 should read, 'He therefore that will be in the way of salvation, let him thus think of the Trinity.' In verse 29 'rightly' should be changed into 'faithfully.' Thus: 'Furthermore it is necessary . . . that he also believe faithfully the Incarnation,' etc. In the last verse, to 'believe faithfully' the words 'and firmly' should be added (*cf.* Barry, 'Teacher's Prayer-Book,' p. 48).

LATIN TEXT OF THE 'QUICUNQUE.'

HYMNUS ATHANASII DE FIDE TRINITATIS QUEM TU O
CELEBRANS DISCUTIENTER INTELLIGE.

[N.B.—The text is that of the Roman Breviary ; but according to it our clauses 19 and 20 are chanted as one verse, as are also our clauses 25 and 26.]

1. Quicumque vult salvus esse : ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem.

2. Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit : absque dubio in æternum peribit.

3. Fides autem Catholica hæc est : ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur.

4. Neque confundentes personas : neque substantiam separantes.

5. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii : alia Spiritus Sancti.

6. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas : æqualis gloria, coæterna majestas.

7. Qualis Pater, talis Filius : talis Spiritus Sanctus.

8. Increatus Pater, increatus Filius : increatus Spiritus Sanctus.

9. Immensus Pater, immensus Filius : immensus Spiritus Sanctus.

10. Æternus Pater, æternus Filius : æternus Spiritus Sanctus.

11. Et tamen non tres æterni : sed unus æternus.

12. Sicut non tres increati nec tres immensi : sed unus increatus et unus immensus.

13. Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius : omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus.

14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes : sed unus omnipotens.
15. Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius : Deus Spiritus Sanctus.
16. Et tamen non tres Dii : sed unus est Deus.
17. Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius : Dominus Spiritus Sanctus.
18. Et tamen non tres Domini : sed unus est Dominus.
19. Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque Personam Deum et Dominum confiteri : Christiana veritate compellimur ;
20. Ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere : Catholica religione prohibemur.
21. Pater a nullo est factus : nec creatus nec genitus.
22. Filius a Patre solo est : non factus nec creatus sed genitus.
23. Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio : non factus nec creatus nec genitus sed procedens.
24. Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres : unus Filius, non tres Filii : unus Spiritus Sanctus, non tres Spiritus Sancti.
25. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius : nihil majus aut minus.
26. Sed totæ tres Personæ : coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales.
27. Ita ut per omnia (sicut jam supra dictum est) et Unitas in Trinitate : et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.
28. Qui vult ergo salvus esse : ita de Trinitate sentiat.
29. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem : ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.
30. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur : quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei filius, Deus et homo est.
31. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus : et homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus.
32. Perfectus Deus, perfectus homo : ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.
33. Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem : minor Patre secundum humanitatem.
34. Qui licet Deus sit et homo : non duo tamen sed unus est Christus.
35. Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carnem : sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum.

36. Unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ : sed unitate Personæ.

37. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo : ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.

38. Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos : tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

39. Ascendit ad cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis : inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.

40. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis : et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.

41. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam æternam : qui vero mala, in ignem æternum.

42. Hæc est fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit : salvus esse non poterit.

ON THE WORD 'TRINITY.'

A VERY brief notice of this word must now be given. The first writer who employs the term is Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 181, who speaks of the three days of Creation which preceded the creation of the sun and moon as types of the Trinity—viz., of God, His word, and His wisdom ('Ad Autolychon.,' lib. ii. : τύποι Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ). Tertullian is the earliest Latin writer who uses the term. The word received synodical authority in the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 317. It appears to have been derived from the Greek *τριά*—*τριάδος*. The Trinities of Zoroaster, Plato, and others were not what we mean by a Trinity—viz., tripersonal unity—but three distinct, created divinities, embodiments of the various powers of nature. Yet it is possible that they were corrupted patriarchal traditions. The whole significance of the Trimourti of Hindustan is utterly unlike that of the Trinity, the likeness being in number only. And it is now ascertained that the gods of the Trimourti were unknown to the Vedas and more ancient books of the Hindus, and possibly the origin of the doctrine may be traced to a mingling of Christian doctrine with Indian theosophy.

The doctrine itself was not altogether new even in the earliest days of Christianity. It was maintained against Calixtus, the Lutheran, that 'the doctrine of the Trinity is so clearly contained in the Old Testament as to admit of being deduced from it without the aid of Apostles and Evangelists. We may not perhaps allow quite as much as this, yet we shall be prepared to admit that the Old Testament presents us with a doctrine of the Divine Unity which is very far removed from the Monotheism of the Koran.' And the late Canon Liddon (Bampton Lectures, p. 51)

says : ' Within the uncreated and unapproachable Essence Israel could plainly distinguish the shadows of a Truth which we Christians fully express at this day when we "acknowledge the glory of the Eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty worship the Unity." '

INDEX.

A.

ACACIUS of Cæsarea, 86, 122
 Acesius, a Novatianist bishop, 39
 Ado of Vienne, 102
 Aëtius, 92, 95, 96
 Alcuin, 145, 173, 186
 Alexander, Bishop, 47
 Amalarius Fortunatus, 131, 173,
 191
 Ambrose, St., 5, 7, 10, 27, 112
 Anatolius, 96
 Anomæans, 92
 Anthelmus, Joseph, 144, 154
 Anthimus, 99
 Apostolic Constitutions, 27
 'Apostolorum Symbolum,' 110-
 132
 Aquileia, Creed of, 120, 121
 Arianism, 55, 76
 Ariminum, Creed of, 84
 Aristotle, 23, 24, 56
 Articles of Religion, their object, 1
 Athanasian Creed, 133-228
 Athanasius, St., 57-93, 122
 Atto of Vercellæ, 190
 Augustine, St., 206-209, *et al.*
 Autun, Canon of, 141, 190
 Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, 209

B.

Ballerini, the brothers, 189
 Baluzius, 142, 147, 177, 190
 Baptismal Creed of Carthage, 27
 " " Hermiane, 118

Baptismal Creed of Milan, 28
 " " Rome, 132
 " " Thapsus, 118
 Baronius, 7, 199
 Barry, Bishop, 181-183, 225
 Basil, Magnus, 37, 38
 " St., 65-70
 Beatus of Astorga, 131
 Bede, Venerable, 102
 Benedict VIII., Pope, 108
 Bingham, 5, 16, 108
 Bobbio, monastery of, 156
 Boniface, Bishop of Carthage, 99
 Bouhier Commentary, 178, 206
 Bremen, manuscript of Church of,
 164-168
 Bright, Canon, 93
 Browne, Bishop Harold, 6, 10,
 108
 Bruno manuscript and Psalter
 175-177
 Bryling, 200
 Bull, Bishop, 56, 65

C.

Cæsarius of Arles, 209
 Capitulare, 191
 Cassianus, Johannes, 5, 7, 112,
 122, 132
 Cave, Dr., 33, 144
 Celts, 31
 Ceriani, Dr., Milan, 156
 Chapters, the Three, 119, 127
 Charlemagne, 102, 131, 212

- Charles the Bald, 167
 Chrodegand, Bishop of Metz, 130
 Chrysostom, St., 67, 122
 Cicero, 21
 Colbertine manuscript of 'Quicunque,' 159
 Colbertine manuscript of 'Quicunque,' curiosities of, 160
 Colbertine manuscript of 'Quicunque,' text of, 162
 Competentes, 27
 Constans, 80, 81
 Constantine, 47
 Constantinopolitan Creed, 95, 99
 Constantius, 83
 'Contesseratur,' 10
 Cosins and Jones, 6
 Council of Antioch (A.D. 269), 38
 " " Nicæa (A.D. 325), 54-65
 " " Tyre (A.D. 335), 76
 " " Antioch (A.D. 341), 78
 " " " (A.D. 344), 81
 " " Sardica (A.D. 347), 88
 " " Sirmium (A.D. 351), 82
 " " Milan (A.D. 355), 83
 " " Sirmium (A.D. 357), 86
 " " Ancyra (Synod) (A.D. 358), 86
 " " Seleucia (A.D. 359), 87
 " " Niké (A.D. 359), 87
 " " Ariminum (A.D. 359), 84
 " " Alexandria (A.D. 362), 88
 " " Alexandria (A.D. 363), 88
 " " Antioch (A.D. 363), 88
 " " Lampsacus (A.D. 364), 93
 " " Constantinople (A.D. 381), 93
 " " Hippo (A.D. 393), 123
 " " Toledo II. (A.D. 405), 210
 " " Ephesus (A.D. 431), 98
 " " Ephesus (Robber Synod), (A.D. 449)
 " " Chalcedon (A.D. 451), 94, 98, 162, 169
 " " Carthage (A.D. 525), 99
 " " Jerusalem (A.D. 536), 99
 Council of Constantinople (A.D. 536), 99
 " " Constantinople (A.D. 553), 99
 " " Toledo III. (A.D. 589), 100, 107
 " " Toledo IV. (A.D. 633), 122, 210
 " " Toledo V. (A.D. 638)
 " " Heathfield (A.D. 680), 102
 " Sixth General (A.D. 681), 100
 " of Toledo XVI. (A.D. 693), 122
 " " Gentilly (A.D. 767), 102
 " " Toledo (A.D. 785), 131
 " " Nicæa II. (A.D. 787), 102
 " " Frankfort (A.D. 794), 103, 191, 210
 " " Friuli (A.D. 796), 103, 187, 211
 " " Aquis-Grani (A.D. 809), 104
 " " Arles (A.D. 813), 188, 212
 Cudworth, Dr. Ralph, 21-71
 Cyprian, St., 6-43, 113-117
 Cyril, Alexandria, 4, 94, 192, 209
 " Hieros., 26, 97, 118
 D.
 'Damnatory' clauses, 215-223
 Daniel, Canon Evan, 166, 181
 Dated Creed, the, 84
 Dedication, Creed of, 78
 'De Fide et Symbolo,' 124
 Denebert, Bishop of Worcester, 175, 217
 'Descendit ad inferna,' 85, 121-123
 Development, 59
 Dicasts, 10
 'Dictionary of Christian Antiquities,' 108, *et al.*
 Diodorus Siculus, 24
 Diogenes, Bishop of Cyzicus, 95
 Dionysius, Alba, 83
 " of Alexandria, 57, 68

'Disputatio Puerorum,' 176

Docetists, 30, 43

Doctrine of Church of England
identical with that of primitive
Church, 3

Dualism—Dualists, 19

Dupin, 144

E.

Eastern Creeds, 5, 12

Eginhard, 104

'Εκ τῆς Οὐσίας, 44, 63

Elipandus, 103-131, 186

Elusius, Cyzicus, 93

Emanatists, 57

Encomiums upon the Creed, 131

Epicurus, 20

Epiphanius, 14, 18, 92-119, 122

'Epistola Canonica,' 189

Etherius, 122, 131

Eudoxius, 86-96

Eusebius, Cæsariensis, 52, 56,
122

Eusebius, Creed of, 48

„ of Doryleum, 95

„ „ Gallus, 127

„ „ Nicomedia, 50, 52

„ „ Vercelli, 83

Eustathius, 90, 122

Eutyches, 95

Euzoïus, 89, 122

F.

Fabricius, 113, 146

Facundus Hermianensis, 118-127

Felix of Urgella (or Orgell), 103,
131, 186

Ffoulkes, Rev. E., 120-164

'Fides Catholica,' 190, 195

'Filioque,' 100-105, 147

Firmilian, 57

Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, 153,
173

Fullo Peter, 107

Φύσις, 70

G.

Gavantus, Barthol, 199

Gelasian Sacramentary, 27

Gelasius, St., Creed of, 118, 122

Gibbon, 125

Gnostics, 56

God, Oneness of, 18, 19

„ Unity of, 18-25

Gotteschalk, 218

Greek titles for Creed, 4

Gregory and Firmilian, 57

„ Magnus, 183

„ Nazianzen, 66, 71, 139

„ Nyssen, 4, 38, 72

„ Thaumaturgus, 37

Gwatkin, Rev. Professor, 47-97

H.

Haddan and Stubbs, 148, 175

Hadrian, Pope, 164-168

Halifax, Viscount, 134-138

Harduin, 195, 203

Hardy, Sir T. Duffus, 158

Harnack, 111

Harvey, Rev. W. Wigan, 15-56,
209

Hatto, Bishop of Basle, 144, 203

Haweis, Rev. H. R., 107

Heideggeras, 144

Hermiane, Creed of, 127

Hermogenes, 13

Herzog, 78

Heurtley, Rev. Professor, 26-35,
112-146

Hey, Dr., 10

Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 83

„ St., 58-67, 147

Hildegard, 165

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims,
143, 195, 217

Homer, 6

Homœians, 96

Homœousion, the, 54-62, 77, 93

Honorius, Emperor, 125

Hort, Dr., 49

Hosius of Cordova, 47, 50

I.

Ignatius, St., 29-42, 126

Irenæus, St., 5-56, 89-121

Isidore, 4-6, 139

„ Mercator, 100

J.

Jerome, St., 5, 33, 112, 129

Jerusalem, Creed of, 97

Johnson's Anglo-Catholic Library,
218
Julius, Pope, 119-122
Junius, 25, manuscript, 145, 217
„ „ text of, 222
Justin Martyr, 30, 43, 110

K.

Kavón, 5
Kattenbusch, 110
Κηρύγματα, 111
King Athelstan's Psalter, 163
King, Lord Chancellor, 4-18, 108

L.

Lambecius, 164-168
Lambeth Conference, 1897, 223
Latin text of 'Quicunque,' 226-228
Lauricius, 87
Leo, St., Magnus, 112, 118
Leo III., Pope, 104, 106
Leodegar, St., 141
Liberius, Pope, 93
Liddell and Scott, 11
Liddon, Canon, 42-61, 106, 229
Lisle, Monsieur de, 183
'Literary History of France,' 146
Luchi, Michael Angelus, 146
Lucian, Martyr, 40, 77
Lumby, Prof., 5-40, 78-217
Luther, Martin, Dr., 113, 196

M.

Mabillon, 128-131
Macedonius, Macedonians, 90, 93
Macrina, 38
Μακρόστιχος, 81
Manichæans, 57, 67
Mansi, 84, 99-108, 187-213
Manuscripts of 'Quicunque,' 133-172
Marcellus, Marcellians, 62, 96, 119
Marcion, Marcionites, 13, 67
Maris of Chalcedon, 80
Mark of Arethusa, 82
Martene, 27, 105, 197
Maximus Taurinensis, 8, 126
Meletius, 89
Migne, 104-217

'*Militiæ Sacramentum*,' 5
Milner, Rev. Joseph, 82
Montfaucon, 145, 156
Moses Maimonides, 22
'Mundo, De,' 74
Muratori, 27, 145-156

N.

Narcissus, 80
Neale, Dr., 104
Neander, Dr. Auguste, 33
Newman, Cardinal, 2, 56-93, 220
Nicene Creed, text of, 51
Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed
Textus Receptus, 108
Nicetas, 125
Nicolas, Pope, 105
Niebuhr, 33
Niké, 87
'*Normam prædicatione*,' 6, 29
Nouveau Traité de Diplomatie,
168
Novatian, 5, 38-43, 116
Novatus, 39

O.

Offa, King of the Mercians, 186
'Of one essence,' 52, 61
Olivet, Mount, monks of, 104, 143
147, 203
Ommaney on 'Quicunque,' 140-224
'*Ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ*, 44-61
One cause—infinite, 22-25
Oratorian Commentary, 179
Origen, 13, 36, 56, 68, 121
Origin of evil, 13
Original purpose of 'Quicunque,'
193
Oudin, 127
Ὅσια, 57, 69, 72

P.

Pagi, 168
Paul, St., Creed of, 17
Paulinus of Aquileia, 103, 149, 211
Paululus, 204
Paulus of Samosata, 38, 50, 57, 77
Pearson, Bishop, 30, 90, 92, 117,
121, 200
Peckham, Archbishop, 218

Pepin, 144
 Peripatetics, 69
 Perpetuity of the Church doctrine, 3
 Petavius, 67-71, 200
 Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, 46
 Petrus Chrysologus, 7, 9, 26, 125
 Photinus, 82
 Photian Controversy, 105
 Pirminius, 112, 129, 158
 Πιστεύομεν, 12
 Plato, 20-24, 74
 Platonists, 68
 Pneumatomachi, 90, 96
 Polycarp, St., 29
 Polytheism, 19, 55
 Porphyrians, 50
 Porphyry, 56
 Πόθεν τὸ κακόν, 13, 19
 Pothinus, 31
 'Prisca Canonum translatio,' 100
 Πρόσωπον, 66, 73, 75
 Provincialisms, 33
 Puritans, 39
 Pusey, Dr., 33
 Pythagoras, 20

Q.

Quesnel, Paschasius, 144
 Quien, Le, 146
 'Quicunque vult,' 133-230
 " " comments upon, 173-184
 " " manuscripts of, 155-172
 " " first attributed to St. Athanasius, 164
 " " in Roman ritual, 194
 " " exalted to rank of a Creed, 197
 " " titles of, 195
 " " original language of, 199
 " " reception into the Church, 202
 " " Greek copies of, 199

'Quicunque vult,' errors in English translation, 224

R.

Radcliffe, Rev. J., 140
 Ratherius, 196
 Ratramn, 105
 Ravenna, Creed of, 125
 Reccared, King of Goths, 100, 107
 Redditio Symboli, 27
 Regino, Abbot of Prum, 142, 193-196
 'Regula Fidei,' 5, 43
 'Religio illicita,' 9, 43
 'Resurrecturi sunt,' 161
 'Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis,' 129
 Robertson, 'Church History,' 31, 33, 50, 52, 82
 Roman Church, Creed of, 123
 Romilly, Lord, Master of the Rolls, 158
 Routh, Dr. Martin, 100, 140, 179
 Rufinus of Aquileia, 5, 9, 35, 112, 120-125

S.

Sabellians, 56, 62, 73
 Sacra, 8, 10
 'Sacramentarium Gallicum,' 14
 Salvian, 5
 Scara, Scarapsus, 113
 Schaff, Professor Philip, 56-73, 139, 141, 166, 170, 198
 Schleiermacher, 20
 Secundus, 50
 Semi-Arians, 92
 Services of the Church, 107
 Shedd, Prof. W. T., 73, 112
 Simon Magus, 14
 Sixth General Council, definition of, 179
 Smaragdus, 104
 Socinians, 91
 Socrates, 40-140
 Sources of the 'Quicunque,' 206-214
 Sozomen, 52, 78

Stavelot Commentary, 175
 Substantia, 66, 72, 83
 Suicerus, 5-7, 210
 Σύμβολον, 6, 11
 Swainson, Prof., 2, 163, 166, 173,
 174, 194, 196
 'Symbolum Fidei,' 191

T.

Tallies, 10
 Tarasius, 103
 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 134-
 136
 Tertullian, 5, 10-90, 113-120
 'Tessera,' 10
 Theistic Creeds, 14, 18
 Θέμελιον, 16, 41
 Theodore, Archbishop of Canter-
 bury, 102
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 169
 Theodore the Thracian, 80
 Theodoret, 4, 14, 18, 69, 122
 Theodorus Lector, 107
 Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, 143,
 177, 188
 Theognis, 50, 52
 Theonas, 50
 Theophronius, 79
 Theories of the origin of evil, 13,
 14
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 174, 188
 Tillemont, 33, 93
 Timothy, Archbishop of Constan-
 tinople, 107
 Traditio Symboli, 27, 160
 Trinity, 69-230
 Tritheism, 73

U.

Uncreated nature, the, 57
 Unitarianism, 74
 Unity of the Godhead, 13-19, 55,
 58
 Ὑπόστασις, 65-72
 Ursacius and Valens, Bishops, 85
 Usher, Archbishop, 113, 158, 159
 Utrecht Psalter, 112, 157-159

V.

Valens, Emperor, 93
 Valentinian, Emperor, 89
 Valentinians, 13, 56
 Venantius Fortunatus, 123-128,
 145, 153
 Vigilius, Pope, 99
 Vigilius Tapsensis, 118, 144
 Vincentius Lirinensis, 145, 169
 " 'Commonitorium',
 compared with
 'Quicumque,'
 150-152
 Vossius, Gerrard, 144, 147

W.

Walafrid, Strabo, 108
 Waterland, Dr., 141-217
 Warning clauses of 'Quicumque,'
 153, 154
 Western Creeds, 5, 12
 Wheatley, 10
 Whytechurch, Edward, 196
 Willehad, Bishop of Bremen, 165
 Worcester, Bishop of, 134-138

Z.

Zahn, 111

THE END.

~~4~~ (Dogm.) 238P
Callow, d. C135
cop.1

History of the creeds

238P

C135

cop.1

